DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 098 PS 021 155

AUTHOR Hasbach, Corinna; And Others
TITLE Holistic Literacy: Voices Integrating Classroom Texts in Social Studies. Elementary Subjects Center Series No. 64.
INSTITUTION Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects, East Lansing, MI.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Nov 92
CONTRACT G0087C0226
NOTE 81p.; For related documents in this set of papers on curriculum integration, see PS 020 998 and PS 021 154.
AVAILABLE FROM Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects, Institute for Research on Teaching, 252 Erickson Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824-1034 ($7).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Research; *Cognitive Development; *Critical Thinking; Elementary School Students; Grade 5; *Holistic Approach; *Integrated Activities; Intermediate Grades; Interviews; Learning Activities; Racial Discrimination; Sex Discrimination; *Social Studies; *Student Attitudes; Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Collaborative Teaching; Social Construction of Reality; *Social Studies Teachers

ABSTRACT

As part of a larger examination of student perspectives in science, social studies and communication arts, this report uses qualitative methodology to explore two teacher-researchers' collaborative teaching of social studies and students' construction of meaning in social studies. Teacher-researchers involved in the overall study included two fifth-grade teachers, one third-grade teacher, two university professors, and three doctoral students in teacher education. A fifth-grade teacher and a doctoral student co-planned and co-taught a social studies class for 1 year. From a group of 47 fifth-grade students, 10 students were targeted for in-depth interviews in social studies; this report focused on 5 of the 10 students interviewed. Analysis centered on: (1) students' developing dispositions to think as social scientists; (2) their abilities to take a critical posture towards text (living, social, and academic text); and (3) their capacities to transfer social studies concepts to their own lives. Analysis of student interviews also focused on the concepts of perspective, racism, sexism, exploitation, discrimination, power, and empathy. Findings showed that students recognized multiple sources for authority in studying historical events, and that students integrated the concepts studied into their daily lives in different ways. Excerpts from student journals and interviews are included. (Contains 43 references.) (MM)

$7.00

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED354098

Elementary Subjects Center
Series No. 64

HOLISTIC LITERACY: VOICES INTEGRATING CLASSROOM TEXTS IN SOCIAL STUDIES

Corinna Hasbach, Constanza Hazelwood,
Elaine Hoekwater, Kathleen J. Roth,
and Michael Michell

Center for the
Learning and Teaching
of Elementary Subjects

Institute for
Research on Teaching
College of Education
Michigan State University

PS 021155

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MSU is an affirmative action/equal opportunity institution

Elementary Subjects Center
Series No. 64

HOLISTIC LITERACY: VOICES INTEGRATING CLASSROOM TEXTS IN SOCIAL STUDIES

Corinna Hasbach, Constanza Hazelwood,
Elaine Hoekwater, Kathleen J. Roth,
and Michael Michell

with
Literacy in Science
and Social Studies Colleagues

Kathleen Peasley, Carol Ligett,
Barbara Lindquist, and Cheryl L. Rosaen

Published by

The Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects
Institute for Research on Teaching
252 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034

November 1992

This work is sponsored in part by the Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects, Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University. The Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects is funded primarily by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the Office or Department (Cooperative Agreement No. G0087C0226).

Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects

The **Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects** was awarded to Michigan State University in 1987 after a nationwide competition. Funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, the Elementary Subjects Center is a major project housed in the Institute for Research on Teaching (IRT). The program focuses on conceptual understanding, higher order thinking, and problem solving in elementary school teaching of mathematics, science, social studies, literature, and the arts. Center researchers are identifying exemplary curriculum, instruction, and evaluation practices in the teaching of these school subjects; studying these practices to build new hypotheses about how the effectiveness of elementary schools can be improved; testing these hypotheses through school-based research; and making specific recommendations for the improvement of school policies, instructional materials, assessment procedures, and teaching practices. Research questions include, What content should be taught when teaching these subjects for understanding and use of knowledge? How do teachers concentrate their teaching to use their limited resources best? and In what ways is good teaching subject matter-specific?

The work is designed to unfold in three phases, beginning with literature review and interview studies designed to elicit and synthesize the points of view of various stakeholders (representatives of the underlying academic disciplines, intellectual leaders and organizations concerned with curriculum and instruction in school subjects, classroom teachers, state- and district-level policymakers) concerning ideal curriculum, instruction, and evaluation practices in these five content areas at the elementary level. Phase II involves interview and observation methods designed to describe current practice, and in particular, best practice as observed in the classrooms of teachers believed to be outstanding. Phase II also involves analysis of curricula (both widely used curriculum series and distinctive curricula developed with special emphasis on conceptual understanding and higher order applications), as another approach to gathering information about current practices. In Phase III, models of ideal practice will be developed, based on what has been learned and synthesized from the first two phases, and will be tested through classroom intervention studies.

The findings of Center research are published by the IRT in the Elementary Subjects Center Series. Information about the Center is included in the IRT Communication Quarterly (a newsletter for practitioners) and in lists and catalogs of IRT publications. For more information, to receive a list or catalog, or to be placed on the IRT mailing list to receive the newsletter, please write to the Editor, Institute for Research on Teaching, 252 Erickson Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034.

Co-directors:	Jere E. Brophy and Penelope L. Peterson
Senior Researchers:	Patricia Cianciolo, Sandra Hollingsworth, Wanda May, Richard Prawat, Ralph Putnam, Taffy Raphael, Cheryl Rosaen, Kathleen Roth, Pamela Schram, Suzanne Wilson
Editor:	Sandra Gross
Editorial Assistant:	Tom Bowden

Abstract

Using qualitative methodology, this report explores two teacher-researchers' collaborative teaching of social studies and the students' construction of meaning in social studies. It delves into the fifth-graders' developing dispositions to think as social scientists, their developing propensity towards a "literacy of thoughtfulness," their abilities to take a critical posture towards text (living, social, and academic text), and their capacities to transfer social studies concepts to their own lives. The report examines what sense students make of social studies and the ways in which they integrate social studies concepts within subject matter and the ways in which they transfer this knowledge to a wider community. It investigates the ways in which (1) social issues are to a great extent the fabric of social studies, (2) students can assume a stance of critical thinking in relation to social studies content, (3) diversity is celebrated (versus "difference is tolerated") within the social studies learning community, and (4) the lives of the students and teachers are "history in the making," and therefore, need to be "read" along with all the other resources.

Prologue to a Set of Papers on Integration Including

Holistic Literacy:
Voices Integrating Classroom Texts in Social Studies (ESC Series No. 64)
Corinna Hasbach, Constanza Hazelwood,
Elaine Hoekwater, Kathleen J. Roth, Michael Michell

Integration from the Student Perspective:
Constructing Meaning in a Writers' Workshop (ESC Series No. 62)
Cheryl L. Rosaen, Barbara Lindquist, Kathleen Peasley, Constanza Hazelwood

Integration from the Student Perspective:
Constructing Meaning in Science (ESC Series No. 63)
Kathleen J. Roth, Kathleen Peasley, Constanza Hazelwood

The Literacy in Science and Social Studies Project

Each paper in this set explores integration from the perspective of fifth-grade students who were the focus of our collaborative teaching and research across the school year, 1990-91. We are a group of school-based and university-based educators who have been working together for the past three years in a project called the Literacy in Science and Social Studies Project (LISSS). In this project we have been exploring ways to teach for understanding in science, social studies, and communication arts, with an emphasis on studying ways in which discourse and writing can be used effectively to promote understanding.

Taking on Teacher-researcher Roles

During 1990-91, each of the group participants (two fifth-grade teachers, one third-grade teacher, two university professors, three doctoral students in teacher education) took on what we called a teacher-researcher role. Through collaborative planning, teaching, and researching we tried out new ways of changing and studying our practice and new ways of studying students' thinking and learning as it develops in a classroom setting. Cheryl Rosaen and Barbara Lindquist co-planned and co-taught writers' workshop with the two fifth-grade classes, with Constanza Hazelwood and Kathleen Peasley providing data collection assistance. Kathleen Roth and Kathleen Peasley co-planned for science across the fall; Roth taught science to Lindquist's fifth graders while Peasley taught science for Elaine Hoekwater's fifth-grade students. Hazelwood,

Lindquist, Hoekwater, Corinna Hasbach, and Rosaen assisted in data collection while Roth and Peasley taught science. Social studies for both fifth-grade classes was co-planned and co-taught by Hoekwater and Hasbach, with Hazelwood again providing research assistance.

Although we often worked in subject-specific subgroups (science, social studies, writers' workshop) for planning and teaching purposes, the centerpiece of the LISSS Project was a weekly two-hour study group involving all project participants. During the first year of the project, this study group focused on study and discussion of what it means to teach for understanding, how discourse and writing can be used as tools for understanding, and what sort of learning community needed to be established for *all* students to develop personally meaningful understandings of social studies, science, and communication arts. When we took on the new teacher-researcher dimension to our work in our second year together, study group became a place to share in our study of our students' thinking and learning and to study our teaching practice. We reflected together on the changes that each of us was implementing in the classroom. We worked collaboratively to develop research questions and data collection techniques for the cases of teaching and learning we were developing. We talked extensively about the 47 fifth graders and their thinking and learning.

Our Initial Views About Integration

We began our work together with an interest in better understanding the role that writing could play in science and social studies teaching and learning. We believed that new approaches to writing and classroom discourse could support students in developing more meaningful understandings of science and social studies concepts. Our view of "understanding" initially emphasized two aspects of integration. First, we wanted students to develop connected networks of concepts in each subject area, not just to memorize lists of words and dates. Secondly, we wanted students to integrate their study of science, writing, and social studies with their personal lives and experiences and ideas. We did not address a third kind of integration--cross-disciplinary integration. Although our study group discussions cut across the three subject matter areas of interest, each teacher-researcher team was exploring teaching for understanding within one

particular subject matter area. Integrated teaching of science, social studies, and writers' workshop was not a prominent aspect of our plan, although Rosaen and Lindquist did have some goals for getting students to write about subject matter topics in writers' workshop. We viewed teaching for understanding *within* each subject matter area to be a challenging enough task for our first year of joint planning, teaching, and inquiry. Thus, we made few explicit attempts to integrate our teaching of social studies, science, and writing instruction around a common theme or set of concepts. Students explored desert plant and animal adaptations at the same time that they conducted a study of the history of the school and wrote pieces about themselves. They studied concepts of food, energy, cells, adaptations, and evidence in science while they explored the concepts of racism, empathy, discrimination, freedom, democracy, power, exploitation, and perspective in social studies. Descriptive writing techniques, authorship, revision, collaboration, and point of view were emphasized in writers' workshop. While many of these topics and concepts could have been integrated in our teaching, we did not set that as a prominent goal. An exception was an authors' design unit toward the end of the year in writers' workshop in which students were encouraged to write about science and social studies content.

Learning About Integration From the Students

Our students taught us about integrated *learning* even though integrated *teaching* was not purposefully planned. Each of us conducted in-depth interviews with a subset of the fifth-graders at the end of the school year. Our interviews were clearly defined in our minds as science interviews, social studies interviews, and writing interviews. While each interview was planned to explore ways in which students integrated knowledge within each subject area and ways they integrated their school learning with their personal lives and experiences, questions designed to explore students' ways of integrating across these three subjects were few (because we did not intend in our teaching for such integration to occur). However, students' interview responses raised important cross-disciplinary integration issues. In the science interviews, for example, students used ideas from social studies ("perspective") and writers' workshop ("collaboration") in

meaningful and interesting ways. Such data prompted us to reexamine integration from the students' perspectives both *within* and *across* subject matter areas.

This reexamination of the data from cross-disciplinary as well as disciplinary perspectives enabled us to develop a new framework for thinking about integrated learning and integrated teaching. As an analysis strategy, each subject matter team separately examined the data (individual and small-group student interviews across the year, field notes and transcripts of lessons, student writing in the three subjects across the year, videotapes of small group work in each subject area). Each team looked for evidence of students' cross-disciplinary integration while focusing on studying integrated learning within a particular subject area. The communication arts team (Rosaen, Lindquist, Peasley, and Hazelwood) asked; How did students integrate science and social studies knowledge, skills, and ways of knowing with their development as writers? The social studies team (Hasbach, Hazelwood, Hoekwater, Roth, and Michael Michell, a doctoral student in teacher education, who participated in analysis and writing) asked; How did students integrate their developing knowledge about history and social studies with their personal life experiences? The science team of Roth, Peasley, and Hazelwood asked, How did students integrate science concepts and ways of knowing taught across the year? How did students integrate ideas from social studies and writers' workshop with their science learning? Each of the three subject matter teams then wrote a paper based on their analysis.

Looking across the three papers: Differences. Each subject-matter focused paper describes cases of integrated learning, highlighting those aspects of integration that seemed most salient across the interviewed students. In social studies, the most striking kind of integration constructed by students was integration of social studies concepts with their personal lives, beliefs, experiences, and feelings. Integration of ideas about discrimination and racism, for example, were powerfully connected to the personal lives of students who had experienced significant discrimination. The students in the science paper revealed to us fascinating cross-disciplinary insights as well as meaningful integration of concepts taught across the year in science. Ideas from

writing and social studies like "perspective" and "collaboration" appeared to be very useful to students in describing their understanding of scientific inquiry. In the writing case, links across subject areas were also striking, with students using ideas from social studies and science ("sexism," "discrimination," and "empathy") in their development as writers.

Looking across the papers: A new framework for thinking about integrated learning. As we looked across the three analyses, we found common characteristics in our teaching of the three subjects that helped us explain what might be enabling students to make such powerful connections both within and across subject matter areas. These commonalities suggest that our teaching across these subjects was integrated in many ways that we had not recognized while we were engaged in the teaching. Our teaching in the three subject areas shared common characteristics:

1. **Features of the learning community.** In our study group sessions, we jointly conceptualized the kind of learning community we were trying to create in each of our classrooms. We used Hermine Marshall's (1990) distinction between the metaphor of a classroom as a workplace compared to a classroom as a learning place and developed a list of related qualities that are important to us in creating learning communities that contrast with more traditional, work-oriented classrooms. In work-centered classrooms (like ours in the past) the emphasis is on each individual completing his or her work, often merely for the sake of "getting the job done" rather than for the purpose of learning. In a learning-oriented classroom, students still complete work, but there is an emphasis on how and why the work is being done. Thinking, questioning, discussing, making mistakes, trying new ideas, and so forth are valued and rewarded as much as completing a finished, correct product. We tried to create environments in which everyone's knowledge and experience was valued and respected and in which students as well as teachers felt ownership and engagement in the content of study. We designed strategies to engage students in meaningful learning tasks while avoiding teaching strategies and evaluation patterns that encouraged students to complete work at the expense of making sense and raising

questions. Table 1 summarizes some of the features of the learning community that we strove to create in teaching science, social studies, and writing.

2. **Epistemological orientations of the teachers--knowledge as tentative and socially constructed.** The features of our learning communities described in Table 1 are built upon some basic assumptions we share about the subject matters we are teaching. For example, an important aspect of our learning communities was collaboration. Collaboration was important to us not only because it is an effective way to engage students actively in their learning; collaboration is also a basic aspect of knowledge construction in science, social studies and history, and writing that we wanted to communicate. Rather than presenting science or history knowledge as something that was personal and private--the property of a single individual--knowledge in our classroom learning communities was created by students (and adults) working in collaboration with one another. This emphasis on collective cognition, rather than on the individual, is consistent with a social constructivist epistemology of science or history in which the knowledge rests not external to the individual, but rather is located within the discourse community, "within the corps of human beings with a common intellectual commitment "(King & Brownell, 1966, p. 68). We encouraged students to view their texts (including textbooks, other print sources, videotapes, visitors, statements by other students and teachers, experiments, etc.) as authored, as tentative statements of knowledge, as open to question and change. We wanted to communicate that scientific and historical knowledge are human creations just as are fictional stories created by writers. We wanted students to understand the rules of evidence that are used to create historical and scientific explanations and descriptions and to judge the merits of a literary work, while also understanding ways in which the biases and perspectives of the writer can influence the way knowledge is presented and which knowledge gets presented in official school texts. In all subject areas, students were supported in being critical readers of multiple texts.

Table 1

A Learning Setting vs. a Work Setting:
Creating a Conceptual Change Learning Community

A CONCEPTUAL CHANGE SCIENCE LEARNING COMMUNITY	A WORK-ORIENTED CLASSROOM SETTING
*Sense making and learning as the goal	*Getting the work done as the goal; getting facts learned or activities and projects completed
*Personal, emotional involvement in meaningful and authentic problem situations	*Depersonalized, unemotional relationship with work, getting the products made
*Ownership and commitment by each person; responsibility shared	*Teacher as executive in charge of everything
*Active inquiry and question asking are valued and encouraged	*Getting the right answer is valued and encouraged
*Expertise comes from everyone, is shared; learning is a collaborative process	*Expertise comes from the teacher and learning is a private activity
*Everyone's ideas are valued and respected as useful in the learning process; diversity is celebrated in a caring environment	*Workers need to keep quiet and busy; diversity is a problem for quality control and efficiency
*Good learners listen to each other	*Good workers listen to the teacher
*Public sharing and revising (working out) of ideas	*Only complete, polished final products are shared
*Evidence, not authority, is used to construct new knowledge and judge merits of ideas	*Knowledge comes wrapped in neat packages that are delivered from teacher or text to student; all packages are to be appreciated and not questioned
*Each learner starts and finishes in a unique place; learning as a process of conceptual change	*All workers create the same product or else are failures; learning as a "you have it or you don't" phenomena

NOTE: The metaphor of a learning vs. a work setting for thinking about classrooms was adapted from Hermine H. Marshall (1990) in "Beyond the Workplace Metaphor: The Classroom as a Learning Setting" in Theory Into Practice, 29, 94-101.

3. **Curricular centrality of students' personal lives and experiences.** In all three subject areas, we centered curricular planning around students' thinking and experiences. We thought about the content from the students' perspectives in planning and altered our teaching as we learned more about the students' ideas and experiences. We tried not to shy away from personal connections that might be emotionally laden; in writing and in social studies, students were encouraged to think about, draw from, and share experiences that were important to them--even though at times these experiences were hurtful ones. In science, students were encouraged to have personal reactions and feelings about the content of study. They were able to share their feelings of alienation from science without penalty; they were respected for having a wide variety of personal beliefs about the use of animals in scientific research, and they were introduced to scientists as human beings who had families and personal lives as well as passions for learning about the world around them.

These three commonalities across our classrooms gave us a new framework for thinking about integration from the students' perspectives. This framework for thinking about integrated *learning* is challenging our thinking about integrated *teaching*. We began this study assuming that we were not engaged in integrated teaching. But our students demonstrated some exciting ways in which they were making significant connections among ideas that we never expected. Thus the students challenged us to rethink our definition of integrated teaching. What is integrated teaching? What does integrated curriculum look like? Our entering view, consistent with the literature on integration, was that integrated teaching is built around a conceptually or topically integrated curriculum. Theme teaching, for example, is integrated teaching, because the curriculum is built around a topic or concept that cuts across disciplinary areas. When teachers get together to plan such theme teaching, their discussions focus on conceptual links across the subject areas--about curriculum content. Now we are thinking that such theme teaching may or may not result in integrated student learning. The students have challenged our belief that integrated curriculum is

necessary in enabling integrated learning. Instead, we now see the three commonalities described above as critical factors in creating integrated teaching that supports integrated learning.

Continuing Our Explorations of Integrated Teaching and Integrated Learning

We have learned many lessons about integrated learning from our students. In this paper set, we describe cases of integrated learning and our emerging understandings of the features of the instructional context that supported such learning. The papers focus purposefully on cases of meaningful and successful integration. We chose such a focus because we were surprised and excited to discover that so many students--including many students labelled "at risk"--were able to make such powerful connections. Given the wealth of studies that demonstrate the difficulties students have in transferring knowledge, we think these students' success stories need to be told.

To help us examine and question our emerging framework for thinking about integrated teaching, we want to continue our analyses of students who were less obviously successful in integrating knowledge within and across subjects. This is difficult to study using our existing data because our interviews were not designed to tap cross-disciplinary integration, and each interviewer made clear to the student that the interview was about science or social studies or writing. Students who appeared to have knowledge compartmentalized into disciplines may actually have made some rich connections among the subjects that were not elicited by very many of our questions.

In our future research and teaching collaboration, we want to continue to examine integrated teaching and learning. During the 1992-93 school year, we plan to continue our integrated teaching in terms of our new framework for thinking about integrated teaching: the learning community, epistemological orientations, and curricular centrality of students' personal lives and experiences. In addition, we will explore the role of curricular content integration in supporting integrated learning. Building a curriculum around the theme of "1492--The World 500 Years Ago and Today," we will incorporate as many subject areas as possible in our integrated teaching. Will this curricular integration around a topical theme enable students to make even more

powerful connections than those made by the students reported in these papers? We are not convinced that such an integrated curriculum will appear integrated from the student perspective. We know we will learn a great deal about aspects of integrated curriculum that are meaningful only to the teachers versus aspects that are meaningful to students. We hope that such an inquiry into integrated curricular content will enable us to understand whether our future efforts should focus on teaching for understanding within each subject matter area or should be focused explicitly on integrated curriculum as well, or whether we should aim to strike a balance between integrated and subject specific teaching.

As you read one or more the papers in this set, you may find it helpful to refer back to our three commonalities that cut across all three papers. We also hope you will join us in considering the questions we are raising about integrated teaching and learning: What features of instruction are critical in supporting integrated student learning? We invite your reactions and comments and hope our work stimulates a lively dialogue about these important issues.

HOLISTIC LITERACY: VOICES INTEGRATING CLASSROOM TEXTS IN SOCIAL STUDIES[1]

Corinna Hasbach, Constanza Hazelwood, Elaine Hoekwater, Kathleen J. Roth, and Michael Michell with LISSS Colleagues:

Cheryl L. Rosaen, Kathleen Peasley, Barbara Lindquist, and Carol Ligett[2]

Since the fall of 1989, we have been part of a group of educators (university and elementary school educators) working at a Professional Development School (PDS). We have been working in a project called Literacy in Science and Social Studies (LISSS). The focus of our work has been to explore genuine ways to engage students in their education and to create classrooms that are learning settings for all students. A group of 47 fifth-grade students' learning was studied in three subject matter contexts: science, social studies, and writing. Ten students were targeted for in-depth interviews in social studies. By looking at the students' perspectives, as well as our own, we have gained insights into ways in which students construct meaning in social studies.

In the context of social studies, Corinna Hasbach and Elaine Hoekwater co-planned and co-taught social studies during one school year. Constanza Hazelwood documented the classroom interactions and consulted regularly with the co-teachers. Kathleen Roth consulted with the group.

---

[1]This is one of a set of three papers on curriculum integration originally presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1992.

[2]Corinna Hasbach, a doctoral candidate in teacher education at Michigan State University, is a research assistant with the Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary subjects. Constanza Hazelwood, a doctoral candidate in teacher education at MSU, is a research assistant with the Center. Elaine Hoekwater teaches fifth grade at an MSU Professional Development School. Kathleen J. Roth, associate professor of teacher education at MSU, is a senior researcher with the Center. Michael Michell is a doctoral candidate in teacher education at MSU. Cheryl L. Rosaen, assistant professor of teacher education, is a senior researcher with the Center. Kathleen Peasley, doctoral candidate in teacher education, is a research assistant with the Center. Barbara Lindquist teaches fifth grade and Carol Ligett teaches third grade at an MSU Professional Development School. The authors wish to acknowledge the helpful feedback and encouragement from Marge Harris, Jan Perry, and Julia Johnson Rothenberg.

Using qualitative methodology, we investigated the students' learning and our own collaborative teaching. We studied the fifth-grade students' developing dispositions to thinking as social scientists, their abilities to take a critical posture towards content, and their capacities to transfer social studies concepts to their own lives. We wanted to know in what ways did students construct meaning to become "literate" (Brown, 1991) social scientists, and to what extent did learning in social studies undergird and inform their ways of knowing about the wider community?

This report discusses the ways in which students were able to construct meaning within a social studies context, and within that context develop "knowledge and ways of knowing" which helped them become discerning readers of text. We define this ability to read the various classroom texts as holistic literacy. We define[3] the classroom texts in the following manner, recognizing that the categories overlap, intersect, and are integrative: (1) **academic text** which includes the resources and curricular materials (e.g., textbook), (2) **living text** which includes the race, class, gender, ethnicity, culture, and historicity of students and teacher,[4] (3) and **social text** which includes the rules, norms, social interaction (learning community) intended by the teacher.[5] Our aim was to investigate how this integrated approach, which openly challenges traditional curriculum and teaching methods, impacts learning in social studies and facilitates a more "connected way of knowing."

---

[3]These labels are unique to our work, yet the ideas overlap with other researchers' work, for example, Erickson's (1982) model of taught cognitive learning.

[4]We include sexual identity in the living text, but do not go into it in this paper.

[5]Hasbach conceptualized the living text, Hazelwood conceptualized the heuristic of living, academic, and social texts to distinguish between the texts where participants in social settings as authors of their own worlds, present their voices, their experiences, their histories, and social identities.

Our analysis will focus on concepts that seemed particularly salient to a variety of students, for example, perspective, racism, sexism, exploitation, discrimination, power, and empathy. It is important to note that these concepts were embedded in a study of American history. The full list of concepts (perspective, democracy, freedom, liberty, equality, justice, rights/duties, racism, prejudice, discrimination, sexism, exploitation, power, and empathy) were referred to in different historical contexts across the year (e.g., exploration, colonization, Revolutionary War, Westward expansion, Civil War, and Civil Rights). Although we do not analyze in this report the students' understanding of particular historical events, the students' voices reflect their understanding of specific historical events (e.g., the Trail of Tears, slavery, and Westward Expansion [conquest?]) as they spontaneously talk about these events in interviews.

1. What We Were Attempting To Do

All members of the LISSS group collaborated to create a professional learning community and learning communities in our classrooms. In social studies, Hoekwater and Hasbach modeled collaboration and tried to create an ethos in the classroom of sharing and valuing all voices, ideas, and abilities. We[6] attempted to create a curriculum and a classroom community that was inclusive versus exclusive. We tried to figure out ways in which we could reflect and mirror not only the groups that had traditionally been invisible in the curriculum but also to mirror and reflect the realities of our students. As a community of educators our goals were to learn from one another and to collaborate in ways that would enhance our own learning and that of our students. We stressed the importance of

[6]"We" refers to the teachers Hoekwater and Hasbach.

seeking multiple perspectives in order to more fully understand historical events, and also to listen to diverse perspectives within the classroom.

We tried to be overtly inclusive in regard to race, class, culture, and gender through the content we taught and how it was presented. We acknowledged that in many ways we were making this up as we went along. This approach is new to many educators and therefore we believe it is crucial for all educators to open up their practices to one another and have dialogues about inclusive content and pedagogy. We feel it is imperative that we open up our practice to one another in a nondefensive manner and learn from one another. Guiding us are the questions, "What could I have done differently? What would I have done in a similar situation?"

We are not presenting "exemplary" teaching and learning but rather a forum to build a learning community dialogue around. Genuine learning community dialogue, a dialogue couched in an aura of "humility and respect" (Freire, 1970), is often missing from teacher education and teaching. Instead of a ripping and tearing critique of one another's practice, a mutually supportive, "We're all in this together" attitude needs to be created, acknowledging the adage, "If I knew then what I know now." This report will reflect this theme.

Collaboration Into Literacy

> Life is a journey, not a destination. (Dyer as cited in Putnam & Burke, 1992, p. 38)

We thought of ourselves as journeyers into uncharted terrain, for it was the first time we had framed social studies content with critical social concepts. We were trying to create a learning environment for ourselves

and our students that fostered a community of thoughtfulness. We wanted to cultivate literacy, expansively defined:

> The new literacy ... includes capacities ... to think critically and creatively, solve problems, exercise judgment, and learn new skills and knowledge throughout a lifetime ... to reason carefully; to inquire systematically into any important matter; to analyze, synthesize and evaluate arguments; and to communicate effectively to a variety of audiences in a variety of forms. We have come to call it a literacy of thoughtfulness, since it involves both the exercise of thought and a certain amount of caring about other thinkers in past and present communities. (Brown, 1991, xii-xiii)

To promote this "literacy of thoughtfulness" in our students and in ourselves, it required taking a critical stance and posture towards all we heard and read, in and outside of social studies. We concentrated on having our students become discerning readers of text (academic, social, and living text), becoming aware of the multiplicity of perspectives essential to historical inquiry.

We were guided by the premise that a learning community classroom as well as its content is inclusive (Putnam & Burke, 1992). We wanted our students to share in our effort to approach social studies as inclusive thinking social scientists, valuing multiple perspectives and appreciating diversity in ideas as well as life. We approached the social studies content with multiple perspectives that moved beyond the standard white Western male's social studies curriculum, dominant in the United States. Our curriculum integrated the perspectives of women, African Americans, Native Americans, Hispanics, as well as the students' and teachers' perspectives. The last two perspectives are presented as voices in the text of this paper.

Throughout the year, student voices were central to uncovering the living text of the classroom, and uncovering the ways in which the living, social, and academic texts intersect, overlap, and became an integrated whole. Our aim was to talk with the students, not just at them or about them. We listened to them to learn what they thought and knew about social studies and the learning community. This paper focuses on the voices of the students as well as the voices of the teachers.

The 47 fifth graders (22 in one class and 25 in the other) are predominantly White[7], but included two African-American students (one who transferred into Emerson towards the end of the school year), three Mexican-American students and two students of Native-American descent. The students come predominantly from working class or poor families. The community is a bedroom suburb and located near a mid-size city and a large university. Emerson Elementary is considered to have a high number of "at-risk" students.

Although there were many voices in the classroom, we will be presenting the voices of only 5 of the 10 students[8] we studied in-depth in order to better illustrate students becoming discerning readers of classroom text:

> **Maria-Yolanda** is a Mexican-American student who was most frequently silent in the classroom. She displayed "non-verbal indicators of [dis]engagement" (Brown, 1991) which led us to assume erroneously that she was disengaged in social studies.

---

[7]We have chosen to use the term "White" and capitalize it as Nieto (1992) suggests:

> You will notice that the terms White and Black, when used, are capitalized. I have chosen to do so because they refer to groups of people ..As such, they deserve to be capitalized. Although these are not the scientific terms for race, terms such as Negroid and Caucasian are no longer used in everyday speech or are rejected by the people to whom they refer. These more commonly used words, then, should be treated as the terms of preference. (p. 17)

[8]Names of the students are pseudonyms.

Sarah is a White student who was extremely verbal in class, eager to speak her mind.
Brenda is a White student who was intermittently verbal in the classroom. She often made astute connections between concepts for herself.
Billy is a White student who was most frequently verbal in the classroom. He was a "school smart" student.
Alex is a White student who was extremely verbal in class. His interviews indicated that he received a lot of parental support for learning.
Hasbach and Hoekwater are both White middle-class teachers, who in hindsight did a lot of frontal teaching (teacher talk), tell of the perceptions they had regarding the classroom texts.[9]

2. Theoretical Framework: McIntosh's Phase Theory

As teachers we were struggling with the notion of inclusiveness. We were aware that there were serious problems with the way that the fifth-grade curriculum presented American history. We grappled with issues of visibility and invisibility in historical events. Yet, we didn't have a coherent language that articulated theoretically this awareness of missing groups of people. After reading McIntosh's "Interactive Phases of Curricular Re-Vision: A Feminist Perspective" and "Interactive Phases of Curricular Re-Vision: With Regard to Race" (1983, 1990), we were better able to describe what it was that we were struggling to do with our curriculum. We were reaching for what McIntosh describes as a Phase 4 curriculum and learning community. Yet, often we were bounded by ways of seeing content which insured that we would not reach our goals. Using McIntosh's framework for revisioning the curriculum we retrospectively

[9]We ascribe to the theory that all the social constructs of who we are affect our ways of knowing (see Belenky et al., [1986]) and our ways of seeing the world. We agree with Gannett (1992) when she says:

> It is important to acknowledge the critical insight that women are not all alike--there is no "transhistorical changeless, feminine essence" (Clifford 1989, p. 531)--and that race, class, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and religion are ... important determinants in the social construction of the self.... Gender as a social construct powerfully writes itself onto all of our lives and we must try to decipher its inscriptions and revise them, rewriting them as we side fit. (p. 11)

look at what we did as a learning community. The following is a synopsis of McIntosh's Phase theory:

Phase 1: All-white male history.

An all-white course in the United States history usually begins by describing the voyages of Europeans. The men who reached "the pinnacles" are described: e.g., Columbus and Magellan. The motivations and accomplishments of these men are described, emphasizing their courage and contribution to the expansion of western civilization into the New World.

Phase 2: Exceptional minority and women individuals in history.

A Phase 2 course encourages female students and students of color to emulate the most ambitious of their forbears, and to overcome obstacles to advancement in American society. In the case of Native Americans, there may be an emphasis on those who are seen to have interacted well with the settlers. In the case of women, a few women may be added to the story of the exploration and settlement of America. In elementary social studies, for example, Sacajawea is often added into a Phase 2 study of American history. Sacajawea is highlighted for her help to Lewis and Clark. Sacajewea is a hero who entered men's territory and succeeded. A Phase 2 curriculum communicates to students that women and minorities don't really exist unless they are exceptional by white male standards. They don't exist unless they make something of themselves in the public world.

Phase 3: Minority issues and women's issues (or minority groups and women) as problems, anomalies, absences or victims in history.

"Phase 3 courses focus on, or at least give serious attention to, racism and other systemic oppressions. For example, in the case of Native peoples, the late 19th century U.S. government policy of genocide is recognized" (McIntosh, 1990, p. 5). Phase 3 looks at those peoples who are in the valleys below the pinnacles, bringing us in touch with people without power. "Phase 3 introduces us to the politics of the curriculum. We can't simply "include those who were left out" (McIntosh, 1983, p. 9).

Phase 4: The lives and culture of women and people of color everywhere AS history.

"Phase 3 gives way to Phase 4 at the moment when [women and people of color[10]] refuse to see [themselves] only as a problem and begin to think of [themselves] as valid human beings. In the 4th phase women say: On our own ground, we are not losers; we have had half of the human experience. The fact that we are different from men and diverse within our own group doesn't necessarily mean we are deprived" (McIntosh, 1983, p. 14). In U.S. history, Phase 4 honors a variety of cultures on their own terms, trying to see them through the testimony or actions of their people. Instead of just studying the problems the Native peoples had as a result of European settlement (invasion?), Phase 4 curriculum explores the richness of Indian cultures in their own right. Such a curriculum might explore, for example, "the wholeness and intricacy of Native cosmologies, and the Indians' particular relation to the land and consonance with the spirit in the land, before the Anglo-European ethos of land ownership was imposed. Phase 4 recognizes Anglo-European ideas, actions, and standards as ethno-specific" (McIntosh, 1990, p. 5).

Phase 5: History redefined and reconstructed to include us all.

Phase 5 is a radical revision of curriculum that rests on a radical revision of society and our ways of organizing knowledge and disciplines. McIntosh mentions this phase only briefly in both her papers; it is a phase that is so far from our current experience that it is difficult to even imagine. "A genuinely inclusive curriculum, based on global imagery of self and society, would reflect and reinforce the common human abilities and inclinations ... to collaborate for survival." (McIntosh, 1983, p. 21)

<u>How We Began: Revisioning the Curriculum</u>

In science, Roth and the students (see "Integration From The Student Perspective: Constructing Meaning in Science," 1992) began the year with a

[10]We use people of color instead of minority as minority can be deemed as offensive (see Nieto, 1992). This term is preferable, although not without its own problems, as Nieto (1992) states: Although people of color is accepted and used by a growing number of African Americans, Latinos, Asians, and Native Americans, it, too, is problematic. It implies, for example, that Whites are somehow colorless; it also negates the racial mixing that is a reality among appropriate term and preferable to the others that are available.... It is a term that emerged from these communities themselves. (p. 18)

unit on scientific inquiry. After looking at our social studies text, starting a unit on historical inquiry seemed to naturally evolve. We began with a central focus of Who is a historian? and Where does a historian get evidence from? To encourage the students to think of themselves as historians we decided our students should write the Emerson Elementary History Book. The students interviewed past teachers, students, principals, and custodians. After collecting all the data, students created two different history books representing the collective efforts of 47 "young historians" (Hoekwater, Journal entry, 1991). This process raised questions about our textbook and the perspectives it portrayed and left out.

> What a different start for a school year. Here it was the end of November, and the only time I had used the students' textbook was for a few short pages which introduced the kids to primary and secondary sources. I had a great time working with the kids but, I was really beginning to panic-shouldn't I be at chapter 4 or 5 by now? Usually by this time I had already taught a unit on Native Americans and the Explorers. Now it was back to the drawing board to take a look at what and where we could go next. (Hoekwater, Journal entry, 1990)

We decided to turn our attention to social issues. We agreed that the students should understand key framing concepts in our curriculum. These concepts became critical guideposts in the study of history and "herstory." We framed the course content with the following concepts: Perspective, Democracy, Freedom, Liberty, Equality, Justice, Rights/Duties, Racism, Prejudice, Discrimination, Sexism, Exploitation, Power, Empathy.

We began by having the students reveal their own conceptions about what these terms meant by discussing them in groups. We speculated that in all likelihood they had some inkling of what these concepts meant, but not necessarily a "sophisticated" knowledge. We reinforced the idea that

they did not need to have the right answer, but that they should think about where they might have heard these terms before and what they thought they meant. We then came together as a large group, put all the ideas up on an overhead, and attempted to come to a consensus about the meaning of the terms. We were surprised by the ways in which children were already able to translate complex concepts. For example, Timothy, after being given examples of exploitation stated, "I think it means being taken advantage of."

> Each day we would come back to the whole group and discuss our findings and then together we would agree on a common definition that we could all understand. The power and wonder of team teaching really began to grow. Corinna had so many different experiences to share from her perspective on the understanding of the terms, there was what the students had written, and then my perspective. We began to value the importance that different perspectives could bring to class discussions. We had a lot of valuable real life situations to help bring to our list of social issues. (Hoekwater, Journal entry, 1990)

Some of the motifs which we tried to weave throughout Social Studies were that (1) social issues are to a great extent the fabric of social studies, (2) students can assume a stance of critical thinking in relation to social studies, (3) the celebration of diversity is a valuable goal within social studies, and (4) the lives of students and teachers are "history in the making." We thought of the students and teachers as the living text of the classroom, central to the content of social studies, and their lives were to be "read" along with all the other resources.

We were committed to the principle of appreciating diversity because we believe, as Pfordresher (1991) does, that we have much to gain from diverse voices and realities within education.

> What might we gain from diversity in education, from an effort to hear many different voices within the curriculum? Foremost is the creation of a national culture in which we attend to each person for that person's own sake. Speaking up helps a person previously silenced and marginalized to discover a personal voice, and to feel a strong kinship with others of similar background, whether they be fellow students or writers and thinkers of previous generations....
>
> There is a second, scarcely less significant gain. Exploring diversity means, for each of us, an effort to discover the inner reality of the other, learning about fundamental "otherness." This offers the chance to sense a greater range of possibility in human life and achievement and to discover more about ourselves. (p. 49)

We believe that social issues are an essential part of social studies. Therefore, we consistently used these concepts with the students to help them become aware of social issues which are recurrent throughout history and our contemporary societies (i.e., today's struggle by various groups to overcome oppression).

The students were asked to keep track of incidents that they thought fit with these concepts when they encountered them in their readings, and give reasons why they thought these were examples of the concepts. We believed that the emphasis on these concepts would help the students become more analytical and critical of the social studies text and other resources they were using.

Using these framing concepts was also an attempt to allow the children to see that history is not a long legacy of consensus, but rather that there is much conflict throughout history. Conflict in historical events is often covered up by the benign view which textbooks present. For example, textbook language often obscures minor oppositions, let alone the horrors and atrocities which have occurred throughout history.

We stressed that groups of people have been "invisible" in historical writings. The four groups which we focused on throughout the year were women, African Americans, Native Americans, and Hispanics. The problem of invisibility was established throughout the introductory lesson on colonization, pointing out that many historical resources (for example their textbook) often exclude these groups from their accounts of history, or, when they do include them, do a cursory job of it.

We attempted to make these groups visible to the students by the use of other resources in conjunction with their textbook. Some of the resources we used were: a music collage "One Fine Day" (Wheelock & Weaver, 1985) and They Led the Way (Johnston, 1973, a book of short biographical sketches of women) to illustrate women's role throughout history; excerpts from To Be a Slave (Lester, 1968) which contains narratives written by enslaved African Americans[11]. We were trying to foster an appreciation and a celebration of diversity (versus the "toleration of differences") within the classroom, and we tried to expand it conceptually to the larger cultures in which they exist (i.e., talking about elderly people--ageism, and the physically challenged--ableism).

Before this celebration of diversity could begin, though, we needed to uncover some of the ways in which discrimination manifests itself. We showed the students the film A Class Divided (Frontline program aired on WTVS in Detroit, hosted by Judy Woodruff), hoping that they could experience, albeit vicariously (for there are ethical implications to enacting this kind of exercise), the concept of discrimination by watching the

[11]We struggled with the language of this sentence, for we wanted to illustrate that Africans were not "slaves," they were enslaved. Yet we were not sure whether to state "Africans who were enslaved," "Blacks who were enslaved," or "African Americans who were enslaved." We decided on the last, since Africans were forced to become Americans regardless of when white people sanctioned their inclusion as "American citizens."

exercise Jane Elliot conducted with her third-grade students (she divided her class into "blue eyes" and "brown eyes," where one group received privileges and the other did not, merely on the basis of eye color). Student discussion and journals[12] illustrated they learned something about discrimination based on color from watching this movie and were able to transfer it to other forms of discrimination.

> I fell that was good that Mrs. Elliott did the right thang because later the future they might came a cross a black or Mexican and cut them down bye call them a name that they would not want to be called .... I know how poeple fell Im called Mexican breito [burrito] .... and it dose not hert me. (Maria-Yolanda, Journal entry, 1/8/91)

> I got a very big feeling of respect for Mrs. Jane Elliott. I thought How <u>great</u> it is that someone finialy found a good way to teach how wrong discrimination is. I was a little bit awed, and just a little suprised. I thought it was neat, and amazing that the class could divide against itsself quickly .... I know I have discriminated against people before. like when I'm with a friend and a girl asks to play I would say "<u>NO</u>!" but after this movie I think I would say "<u>yes!</u>" And I would discriminate against people or kids younger than me. I would say "no you cant play with us your to little, kid. But I dont think I would after seeing this movie. I would'nt do that. the Movie had alot of effect one me! (Billy, Journal entry, 1/8/91)

The contrast in these entries is interesting to note in terms of the two students' distinct living texts. Maria-Yolanda speaks of the power the movie has on perhaps stopping others from name calling and Billy speaks of the power it had on him in terms of how he discriminates against others. It seems that on some level Billy recognizes the power he has and Maria-Yolanda realizes that she, and others like her, can be the target of name calling.

---

[12]Student entries are not edited.

What is also fascinating about the different entries, is that Billy's writing seems more skillful and his understanding of the issues seems more "sophisticated" than Maria-Yolanda's. However, what is puzzling is that later on in interviews there seems to be a stark contrast in the way that these two students have internalized the social studies content, with Maria-Yolanda seemingly being far more connected to the subject matter and also more articulate about the social studies concepts than Billy. From the journal writing of other students, it seems that they transferred some of what they learned from the movie to other types of discrimination, for example, sexism, ageism, discrimination on the basis of physical appearance and weight. We will explain these students' ideas further in Section 3.

Through the use of this film and other resources we were trying to have the children see history through the eyes of the people who were involved in the events. A concept that we tried to weave through all the units was one of empathy. Instead of allowing children to detach themselves from historical events, we wanted them to try and "see" what it might have been like for the people involved. The children learned about the definition of empathy and wrote about it, and Sarah seems to have understood it by her explanation of it in her interview. "And empathy is, like, putting yourself in somebody else's shoes and that's kind of ... thinking like, do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

We were not aware of how much they were internalizing the concept of empathy and trying to make sense of other people's experiences until Brenda (B) explained this to the interviewer (I).

B: And we learned about um Black American history and we did lots of stuff. We um, oh we watched um a movie, I think it's

called A Class Divided, and it was about um this teacher and she'd say OK everyone with brown eyes are better than people with blue eyes and um people would make fun of people with blue eyes and the next day she goes I was wrong, the people with blue eyes are better than the people with brown eyes and um the people found out how Blacks felt when people were, were um putting them down because of their color or making fun of them or not including them in some of their things because when she would say blue eyes are better than brown eyes or hazel eyes are better than blue eyes, it would make the other person feel really bad and then she explained at the end how that wasn't really true and no one was better than anyone, everyone was the same. And I thought that was really, really neat because I think that's true because I don't think Black people shouldn't be included in ... and we learned about slavery and how um people were jammed into these boats and if a woman had a child they threw all the babies overboard and how some mothers would go in after their children and they had the weights on their feet or they would hold the mothers that, and um if someone had died because of starvation or something because they only gave them little chips of food and they would just little um sour potato things, they would just throw them out and they would try and catch them in their mouths and if someone died of starvation because they that's all they got was one of those a month, then they could could um, they would just throw them overboard and they wouldn't care about them or anything.... And we learned about how jammed they [Africans] were and so um me and a friend went outside for recess, me and some friends went out for recess and um when we were outside we scrunched up together for about five minutes and we just, we just sat there and it was really hard, I mean we were like Oh I want to move, I want to move, because we were trying to find out what it was like. So me and Karey and--and I think Mary went outside and we did that and it was terrible, and I can't imagine doing that for two months.

I: Did you think of that yourself?

B: Yeah, because we wanted to know what it was really like because we're going well, I don't think it would be too bad, I mean I've been crunched in a car before and it wasn't too bad because it was only a little while. And when we tried it outside for only five minutes and it was like I don't want to do this

anymore so we ended up going and playing with something else but we found out what that was like and that was terrible, I mean I could, and they hardly had anything on, some people didn't have anything on, you know they might have just had a little flap to go over their bottom part or something.

I: So it would get cold?

B: It would get cold and it would, it wouldn't feel very good, I mean if someone was sweating or something and it would get all over you and it would be terrible, And I guess if you had to go to the bathroom there was nowhere to go. I think that would be terrible, I mean I'm, compared to that, everyone right now is like rich compared to what they had to go through on-

I: It's hard to imagine being in that situation.

B: Yeah, I mean I can't even imagine how terrible that would have been if, and having your baby thrown overboard would have been just been terrible and they would have had to live with that for their life.

Brenda seems to feel poignantly the plight of the Africans who were enslaved. She seems to test out the content knowledge she received in social studies against her own understanding, in an attempt to empathize with the Africans, and to personalize what she knew about their situation in a way that was familiar to her own realm of experience.

3. Children as Social Constructors of Knowledge Teachers Needing to Reconstruct Their Own Knowledge

> We should teach children that knowledge is a social construction, that it reflects the perspectives, experiences, and the values of the people and cultures that construct it, and that it is dynamic, changing, and debated among knowledge creators and users.... The classroom should become a forum in which multicultural debates concerning the construction of knowledge takes place. The voices of Western traditionalists, and multiculturalists, textbook authors, and radical writers should be heard and legitimized in the classroom. (Banks, 1991-92, p. 34)

We were guided by the premise that children are social constructors of knowledge, that "the knower is an intimate part of the known" (Belenky, et al., 1986, p. 137), and that we would foster their seeing themselves as such. We wanted them to see that "authority" needs to be challenged and that they themselves can become critical readers of text. In our own thinking about children as social scientists, as creators of knowledge, we used Belenky et al.'s (1986) paradigm of constructed knowing. They state that in constructed knowing students view knowledge as contextual and they experience themselves as creators of knowledge. They value subjective and objective strategies for knowledge.

We also used Belenky et al.'s (1986) metaphor of midwife teachers in order to think about what kind of teachers we would have to be to facilitate a constructivist paradigm of knowing for our students.

> Midwife-teachers are the opposite of banker-teachers. While the bankers deposit knowledge in the learner's head, the midwives draw it out. They assist the students in giving birth to their own ideas, in making their own tacit knowledge explicit and elaborating on it....They support their students' thinking, but they do not do the students' thinking for them or expect the student to think as they do. (pp. 217-218)

We wanted to emphasize that multiple perspectives need to be used to try to make sense of any given historical event. We found that our students did recognize multiple sources for authority. We felt that this was in part due to the multiple voices they heard, including the daily voices of Hasbach and Hoekwater co-teaching. They saw the co-teachers agreeing, disagreeing, and generally modeling social studies discourse for them.

Brenda, in her interview, spoke about the sources for authority and expertise and about learning how to learn. She contrasted her experience

in fifth grade social studies with previous years. She also talked about social studies writing and discourse as important in the constructing of meaning.

> B: Yeah, I didn't like it [social studies] very much before because all we did was read out of our books, our books, our books, and I like reading out of books now because we, we do write in journals and things so we can put down our feelings, we don't just read and read and read, I mean we stop to talk about what happened instead of just reading on and on and if you didn't understand something, then oh well. Now if we don't understand something we have other books that we can look on because people will bring books in and they're really fun to look at because if you have a question about something that happened, um either the other teacher can tell you about it because we usually have one or two teachers in there, or um, and if you don't understand either of what they're saying, you can always look in a different book and see if it explains it differently to see if you understand that. And usually you'll find something that you'll understand that is related to what you don't understand.

Brenda seems to be saying that a teacher's word is not the final word, that she can go to other sources for knowledge and understanding. She seems to have learned how to learn, empowered to search out knowledge for herself. She has learned that she can connect the unfamiliar to the familiar in her own search for understanding.

We recognized the danger of thinking that as teachers we can "arrive," that the knowledge that we have "accumulated" is necessary and sufficient. We believe that understanding is constructed over time and new knowledge raises further questions. Knowledge changes, grows, builds over time, and is never completed. We realized that the complexity, ambiguity, and uncertainty (Cohen, 1988; Lortie, 1975) of teaching and

learning lies in the intersections and overlaps of the different classroom texts (living, social and academic).

The belief that social studies is not disconnected from the student's own historicity helped us shape our curriculum. Students' experiences in the world are part and parcel of the living text of the classroom. As teachers we realized that we needed conceptual tools (ways of thinking) to help read the ways in which gender, race, class, culture, and the students' historicities are part of the unfolding story of the classroom. Our own teacher-education did not adequately prepare us to read the living text of the classroom. But, Maria-Yolanda and Billy helped us to do this.

Maria-Yolanda and Billy made different sense of the concepts discussed in social studies. In light of their different races and cultures, they integrated the concepts differently to their daily life experiences. Maria-Yolanda in her interview links the concept of social studies to her own reality in the classroom.

I: Do you see other social conflicts at school besides the boy and girl conflict?

M: Not really. Well, name calling. Like that's a social conflict because that's not right. There's two people arguing or more.

I: Can you give me an example?

M: I got one. You know when you came in to talk about Texas and how you grew up? Well, Gary had said, well you are just Mexican burritos and then Ms. Hasbach stopped him and started talking about it. I turned around and I said that's not right Gary and then see we were going back and forth and then Ms. Hasbach said wait a minute, I just heard something that I didn't like. So that was something that was a social conflict.

I: How did you feel about Ms. Hasbach saying something?

M: Well I felt good because not every teacher will stop and say something if somebody had started discriminating against you because of your race. Not all teachers would stop in the hall and say don't do that....Why don't she sit down and tell him that it's not right and everybody is the same inside. I mean, everybody has feelings it's just the pigment of their color.

Maria-Yolanda, who most frequently silent in the class, said that she would like to make speeches to the school about discrimination. We felt that she had been empowered to be able to see herself in front of a large group making speeches.

M: I would say something like people are out there discriminating against people's race because they're different than you but nobody is different because they all have the same feelings. Just because their pigment is different there's nothing wrong with them, they're still human.

We speculate that for Maria-Yolanda, her reality was reflected back to her in the texts of the classroom and this facilitated her finding her voice.

She goes on further to say that she sees the world differently than her White peers in class.

M: I would understand how the Mexican Americans and the Hispanics used to feel. This is something I think. I don't think a lot of people in there cared because they don't know what it feels like to be Hispanic and discriminated against. And they don't even know what colored people feel like. I don't think they really cared. I don't think a lot of White people got discriminated against besides the women.

When Maria-Yolanda tells of writing in her journal, the poignancy of the living text is illustrated.

M: They have those journals so we could write how we feel. She told us these journals are for how you feel and I've wrote in it a couple times about how I feel about being called Mexican burritos.

Her voice seems to have been given an outlet in writing. She makes us mindful of the importance of her being able to articulate her feelings and have them legitimated and validated.

Maria-Yolanda also gives us insights into the ways in which gender plays out in her daily experiences in school and has become articulate about sexism.

M: We [she and her friends] have those little discussions on how the boys, you know, their words, how they don't think we're equal and they don't treat us like we're equal. They treat us bad ... they discriminate against us because we're girls. We always talk about that because us girls really don't ever get a chance to play sports without the guys knocking us off the court.

Maria-Yolanda seems confident enough to confront her father about his sexism.

M: Well, I talk to my dad but he lives in Tennessee. I usually talk to him about things like what we talk about and how I think the men discriminate against the women. We'll have those little arguments.

I: What does he say about it?

M: He goes well we didn't discriminate, we were always better. You know, he's always playing. I go, no, we're the same. He would do it and I would get mad.

I: Oh, he's been teasing you about it?

M: Yes because one day he goes, "Guys are always better than girls" and I said, "No they aren't. Just because they can do sports doesn't mean they're better. We're just the same. We would do a lot of things that you guys can't do" He was like speechless.

I: Oh really, that's good.

M: I got him in a position where he was speechless. So he was just quiet and then said. "Oh you want to go do something?"

Billy, in contrast with Maria-Yolanda often seems to place value on the purpose of learning to satisfy school requirements. While he does explicitly relate social studies knowledge to his personal experience, he tends to intellectualize the concepts rather than integrate them on an emotional level.

I: Do you think that it is important to learn all these things?

B: It depends kinda. If you are going to be an historian, yes it would be. And just so you can answer questions in school it's important ... the reason I think I'm glad I know it is because it gives you a better idea about things. Like when we learned about the Black people being discriminated against, it gives you an idea in some of the books that we brought in and read about what they went through and stuff. It kind of makes you stop and think before you go off teasing other people just because they are Black.

Later on in the interview, when asked whether there is anything he has learned in social studies that makes a difference in his own life outside of school, he responds with,

B: I don't think so. I don't know.

I: Do you treat anyone differently because of what you've learned in social studies?

B: No, I don't run into any Blacks, but when I do, I guess maybe I do, I'm not really sure.

Ironically, Billy seems to overlook that there were two African American children in the other fifth-grade class that he encounters daily.

Maria-Yolanda has a far different connection to the concepts which are presented in social studies and talks about the respect for people's feelings when asked the same question.

I: Does anything that you have learned in social studies make a difference in your life outside of school?

M: Yes because I respect people's feelings and their race. That's something we're supposed to do. That's why we had this discussion. If not, we wouldn't even talk about it. I mean, the words and what they mean.

Maria-Yolanda and Billy experience the living text of the classroom, as well as the academic and social text, differently. Their respective cultures, race, and gender affects the ways in which they will construct meaning in social studies. We noticed a difference in the connections which these two students made to the social issues raised in our class. We are left with the question of why Billy is less vested in the content of social studies, whereas Maria-Yolanda is passionately connected? Is it because their living texts are so different that the way in which they approach the content is also so different? The points McIntosh raises in "White Privilege and Male Privilege" (1988) may help make sense of the difference. Perhaps, Billy, as a White male (although still young), is already unconsciously enacting white privilege and can choose to pay attention to issues such as race and gender when he wants to. For Maria-Yolanda, there is no choice, the realities of her race and gender confront her daily, inside and outside of the classroom.

Over the year, we realized that our own teacher education failed to develop ways of thinking critically about academic text. Hoekwater states emphatically that she needs to re-educate herself in regard to the academic text of the classroom,

> I feel so strongly that those of us who teach American history need to be re-educating ourselves. I was a history major in college. Everything was the White Man's Way. We used one

> resource: the textbook. We were taught not to question. (Hoekwater, cited in "Maybe the White Man," 1992, p. 4)

We were not prepared to be "midwife teachers," teachers that would contribute to revisioning the curriculum in a Phase 4 fashion. Instead, we were schooled in the ways that McIntosh (1991) describes as Phase 1 and 2. She describes Phase 1 teaching--I talk you listen; Phase 2 teaching--I bring along the stars; Phase 3 teaching--I let the students have issues and argue with me; Phase 4 teaching--Every teacher is a student; Phase 5 teaching--Education itself is redefined and re-conceptualized to acknowledge all of our capacities for teaching, learning, and knowledge of being.[13] Having not had models from our own experience, nor ever having been taught in a Phase 4 manner, we were trapped by unchallenged tradition. We aspired to a Phase 4 curriculum and teaching, but more often than not fell into Phases 1 through 3.

Curriculum Redefined

In a nascent Phase 4 fashion we saw subject matter not as an isolated and bounded entity but rather as linked and connected to other disciplines and to the "practical things" of the world. We felt that the subject needs to be "known" as van Manen (1982) describes:

> Subjects let us know something. It is in this letting us know that subject matter becomes a true subject: a subject which makes relationship possible. The subject calls upon us in such a way that its otherness, its it-ness turns the dialogic Other: the "you" in this way our responsiveness, our "listening" to the subject, constitutes the very essence of the relationship of a student [or teacher] to subject matter. (p. 295)

[13]We aspired to Phase 4 teaching rather than a Phase 5 teaching because McIntosh says that Phase 5 can only come about when the hierarchies in institutions and in our psyches have been dealt with.

We believe that all bodies of knowledge are connected and undergird and inform one another, that all disciplines are connected and organic, all give pieces to the puzzle of human existence.

In social studies we tried to convey the idea that all historical figures, including ourselves, are all "bodies in the body of the world" (Moore, as cited in McIntosh, 1990), that all are important and worthy of note. It was the first time we had tried to reconceptualize American history. We truly were journeyers in an uncharted terrain, into a way of being in the classroom, a way of encountering subject matter, and a way of speaking with children that was very different than we were used to.

Hasbach brought to the teaching relationship an open and nontraditional, theoretical conception of curriculum. Curriculum was more than just a document which sequentially outlines learning outcomes, or is used to guide a teacher's instruction. Curriculum in her conceptualization is everything which students have the opportunity to learn and not to learn (May, 1990).[14] It is everything teachers have the opportunity to teach and not to teach. It is all the knowledge which is included and excluded from teaching and learning materials. It is the hidden curriculum and the null curriculum. It includes the teachers and learners historicities (experiences affecting what transpires educationally). The curriculum has to do with the questions that cannot or will not be asked, and the answers that cannot or will not be given. The silences within the classroom are as crucial as the spoken words. Both silences and articulated discourse declare who has "voice" and who does not, who has power and who does not. Curriculum is the articulated and silent "tale of power, its use and

[14]Private communication.

abuse" (Grumet, 1978-79, 141). It is the tale of the visible and the invisible.

4. The Classroom Texts

The Living Text: "Restructuring Inside Our Heads."

> What ever gave you the idea that history was any sort of living thing? Really isn't that expectation just the least bit contradictory? (Otto, 1991, p. 5)

The text of all classrooms includes the living text of the students and the teacher. Their gender, race, class, and historicities are part of this living text of the classroom. This living text helps to create the social context in which learning takes place. Without teachers being literate in the ways in which these facets play out in the classroom, and influence the ways in which subject matter is constructed, true literacy is not possible. "Alas, 'literacy' somehow always gets reduced to memorized lists or cultural hegemony, and 'perspective' ends up being my perspective, that is, 'egocentrism'" (Wiggins, 1989, p. 45).

History includes the living text of the classroom, it is a living thing, which is fashioned daily in every social studies classroom. Subject matter does not exist in a vacuum; it is taught by a teacher of a certain gender, race, class, and culture. A teacher enters a classrooms with a historicity that shaped her/his understanding of the discipline. The students she/he teaches also have a gender, race, class, and culture and do have a schema already in place for this living text. Children very early learn their cultural lessons well. By fifth grade they are already able to stratify and differentiate amongst themselves. Reformers claim that history is not being learned and that "social studies lessons generally lack the depth needed to render them meaningful to students and useful in everyday

public life" (Parker, 1989, p. 39). We believe that children are history-in-the-making and they construct history daily within the classroom. By acknowledging and utilizing the principle that the children themselves are the living text of the social studies curriculum, social studies lessons will be relevant and meaningful to them. " The fifth grader who pushes little kids off the slide makes social studies curriculum..." ("Making Sense," 1992, p. 3).

> What avail is it to win prescribed amounts of information about ... history ... if in the process the individual loses his [her] own soul: loses his [her] appreciation of things worth while, of the values to which these things are relative; if he [she] loses desire to apply what he [she] has learned and, above all, loses the ability to extract meaning from his [her] future experiences as they occur. (Dewey, 1963, p. 49)

We agree with Brown (1991) in his claim that "what needs 'restructuring' is not just inside schools or districts; it also inside people's heads" (p. 163). What we found profoundly striking is that fifth graders, as compared to adults, are far more willing to let the "restructuring" occur inside their heads. As adults we are often so invested in our own world views that we have fixed ways of seeing.

Fifth graders seem able to grapple with ideas like equity, justice, discrimination, racism, and sexism. There is much less defensiveness on the part of fifth graders to new ideas. Our students did not seem to deny the possibility of their own tendency towards racism or sexism. For example, Alex talks about stereotyping and sexism without defensiveness and even says that he is glad he is learning about this stuff in social studies so that he won't grow up and "do it." He also alludes to the idea that when support is given at home, it seems to foster the internalization of concepts.

I: What I wanted to ask you is do you ever talk about ideas of equality or justice or racism or sexism outside of social studies?

A: Well, usually I tell my parents what we do in social studies and what we do in my classes. And like they'll bring social studies back up and they'll say like, I know something that happened that maybe you weren't told yet. They'll say, this happened and this happened and then we get a bigger perspective, we get bigger ideas.

I: Can you give me an example of something your parents have told you that gives a bigger perspective?

A: My mom, she's like really high in the Board of Water and Light business and she works for the water and she has her own office and everything and she already uses these big words like discrimination. That's how I learned most of those words before we even used them.

I: Okay, so you learned a lot of these things at home already. Does your mom like it when you talk about these things in social studies like discrimination and stuff like that?

A: She thinks it's good for me to know so that I don't do it.

I: Do you think that's true? That it's good for you so you don't do it?

A: Yes.

The Academic Text: Analytical Tools That Help Restructuring Inside Our Heads and Children Who Became Discerning Readers of Texts

> There are only two ways to deal with tragedy and injustice: show it plainly or hide all traces. (Otto, 1991, p. 15)

> For the most part ... teachers are part of the seamless web of schooling helping to create a denatured social life, void of controversy, void of causes, void of deep caring; socializing, but not countersocializing (Engle & Ochoa, as cited in Evans, 1990). For most ... students, the teaching of history may function as a softened, diffused means of oppression. The boredom and routinization in

> most history classrooms produce a sense of well being, a drowsy feeling that life is acceptable as it is, and that history has little to do with our lives and the decisions we face.
>
> Without explicit attention the philosophical and ideological questions embedded in the teaching of history, without sustained critical reflection on our purposes, reform movements ... will likely serve to reinforce the use of history as a bland form of cultural transmission. They will do little to foster reflective or critical approaches to the teaching of history, and that is very sad. (Evans, 1990, p. 127)

As social studies teachers we did not want to be social anesthesiologists where historical conflict is erased and the "drowsy feeling" which Evans speaks of is produced. We used concepts and questions that would alert students to the recognition that social studies is not a long legacy of consensus. We knew that it would be easy to discard the textbook and replace it with other materials; however, we felt that providing students with the critical thinking tools to search out bias in their textbooks could be used as a way of seeing critically in multiple contexts (other classes, with other materials) throughout their lives.

The analytical tools we used to help ourselves and our students become more critical readers of text were taken from Sadker and Sadker (1982) and include the following: (1) unreality, (2) imbalance and selectivity, (3) fragmentation and isolation, and (4) invisibility.

> Unreality: Textbooks frequently present an unrealistic portrayal of our [United States] history and our [United States] contemporary life experience. Controversial topics are glossed over and discussions of discrimination and prejudice are avoided. This unrealistic coverage denies children the information they need to recognize, understand and perhaps some day conquer the problems that plague our [United States] society.[15] (p. 73)

[15]The reason that we concretize "our" is that we feel we need to recognize that this is "ethnospecific and ethnoparticular" McIntosh, (1991).

We found examples of unreality in the ways in which African-Americans' experiences and Native-Americans' experiences are depicted in the fifth-grade textbook we used, The United States Yesterday and Today written by Helmus, Toppin, Pounds, and Arnsdorf (1990). In the chapter entitled "The English Colonies," the text reads [emphasis added] "The first group of black Africans arrived in Jamestown in 1619.... Black Africans did not start arriving in large numbers until 1680" (p. 121). On the same page there is a picture of White women getting off a boat with the caption reading, "This picture shows a group of women arriving in Jamestown." The main body of the text says, "The first women had arrived in Jamestown in 1619." Implicitly this phrasing makes the "arrival" of Africans analogous with that of women "arriving" to seek mates (p. 121).

The text continues with, "But after 1650 nearly all came as **slaves**. A Slave is a person owned by another person. In America many children of slaves were born into slavery" (Helmus et al., 1990, p. 136). The ways in which the language is used seems to seduce readers into believing that this was a natural condition of African Americans. Lester (1968), in his book To Be A Slave states, "To be a slave was to be a human being under conditions in which that humanity was denied. They were not slaves. They were people. Their condition was slavery" (p. 28). Language obscures reality. The language makes the historical event appear benign and benevolent, as if Africans arrived voluntarily in the same way as the White women did. In calling people slaves, the White human agent doing the enslaving, is removed.

We tried to prepare students to pay attention to the language that was used in texts. They were able on many occasions to discern which language was inappropriate to accurately describe the historical event. For

example, in Alex's interview he talks about the need to use language that explains the situation with veracity.

I: Do you think there's any bias in your textbook?

A: (long pause) I need a refresher course on bias.

I: Okay, bias is something like, like you said before one perspective,or it's similar to discrimination with the idea that you're only getting one side of the story it's you're only getting one picture. For example, with the textbook it may be the White person's perspective, that would be considered bias, or if it's just the man's perspective, that would be considered bias.

A: Okay, yes I think there's quite a bit of bias because like probably most of the people who make this are White and probably men, well maybe. And they think that they're right because that's what they know, but they have a whole different picture then what might have really happened. Instead of saying, like they'd say, they took the Africans and they got on the ship and they brought them over to the New Land, and instead of saying brought they should say they dragged or they stole them, they kidnapped them and they took all their rights away.

I: Is language important do you think?

A: Yes, because when you say took, it sounds like asking someone to come along with you and when you say kidnap you think of like half killing them and throwing them on the ship.

I: And kidnapping is more accurate?

A: Yes, it explains more of what happened.

Sarah also addresses the issue of language in the textbook:

S: And then we went to this book, this prologue to a book called To Be A Slave and that was totally different. I mean, it said that, like, they used different words like we said that, like, the White man came over and got the slaves and then the slaves arrived the next day. Well, the other book said that, like, the

slaves that were kidnapped came the next day and they used, like instead of arrived or came they used stronger words and that they really didn't just come, they were forced to come.

Throughout all the units we looked at language and in the textbook the Trail of Tears is described in the following way. "The journey lasted several months. Disease, hunger, and cold brought death to many" (Helmus, et al., 1990, p. 198). The text makes it sound as if the Native Americans took "the journey" voluntarily. Again, the White human agents, who were forcing them off their land are removed from the description. Benign history once again. The passive voice is being used, or as Gilligan (1990) labels it, "the no voice, voice" of text, to obscure the atrocities committed against the Native Americans.

We used a supplemental resource called <u>The Story of the Trail of Tears</u> (Stein, 1985) which fleshes out "the journey" that the Native Americans "took." This version is not so benign and benevolent in its depiction of what the Native Americans endured. It seemed as if the students were aware of the necessity for undeceptive language that they would even contest an adult's language when it did not parallel the student's own understanding of the historical event. For example, Maria-Yolanda was critical of language that conceals power relationships. She corrected a statement made by Hazelwood during an interview when Hazelwood described westward expansion as a "move":

I: What about the westward expansion and conquest?... Remember when people started moving?

M: <u>Moving because people pushed them off right</u>?... Okay, I would get on all of them <u>people's perspectives who were pushed off their land</u>. The whole book I could want other people's perspective not how they heard about what happened in the

Civil War or things like that, I would like to get people's perspectives.

Maria-Yolanda seems willing to correct Hazelwood when she feels that she may have a better handle on the language to explain the event. This is the second time we see Maria-Yolanda challenging an adult, the first time was when she confronted her father regarding sexism.

What Alex tells us about the Trail of Tears we believe he would not have gotten from the textbook. The additional resource allowed him to get a sense of the anguish the Native Americans experienced.

I: Tell me a little about the Cherokees because we did a little work in class about the Cherokees. Do you remember?

A: The Cherokees were very trusting. They trusted a lot of people and the settlers took that for granted and they just cheated on them and the Indians had nothing they could do.

I: So do you remember what we talked about, what happened to the Cherokees?

A: They would walk along the trails and most of them would die.

I: Do you remember how many did?

A: Twenty-five percent.

I: I don't know about the percent. Do you remember the number?

A: No.

I: Because I remember the number, I don't know what percentage it would be. Like 4,000.

A: Oh, that's right.

I: Do you remember what the trail was called.

A: The Trail of Tears.

I: Why was it called that?

A: Because that was the trail that a lot of Indians died on. It's not like sort of trail of youth, it's more like a trail of death.

I: What did you say first?

A: It's not a trail of youth.

I: Youth, how do you mean that?

A: Like, it's not a trail that you want to walk along for fun, it was used to push the Cherokees away and instead of burying the Indians that died they just like threw them on the side of the road or they would just leave it where it is. [Later on we realized that he was talking about a youth trail.] Jackson...he didn't really give a care, it was like hunting season where you just go out and kill something.

I: Why would people think that it was okay to force the Cherokees off their land, to kill them like that, like you said hunting season? Why was that okay?

A: Because they were White and they thought that White people, it was their destiny to have power and land and money and everything else didn't deserve to live as much as they did.

We had talked briefly about manifest destiny in class. Alex's understanding of how manifest destiny works surfaces from a critical perspective. Often manifest destiny is used to present the spirit behind the White man's claiming the North American continent from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Alex sees manifest destiny not as a heroic act, but rather as hunters going after people whom they considered "animals."

During the class where we read The Story of The Trail of Tears (Stein, 1985), Brenda raised her hand and said, "You know what I noticed," to which Hasbach asked "What did you notice"? Brenda replied, "In the textbook they have two big, long sections on the Boston Tea Party, and

they only have two little, short sections on the Trail of Tears and 4,000 people died on the Trail of Tears." To which Hasbach asked, "Why do you think that is"? Brenda states, "I think it's because the Boston Tea Party is about White men and the Trail of Tears is about Native Americans."

> Imbalance/Selectivity: Textbooks perpetuate bias by presenting only one interpretation of an issue, situation, or group of people. This imbalanced account restricts the knowledge of students regarding the varied perspectives that may apply to a particular situation. Through selective presentation of materials, textbooks distort reality and ignore complex and differing viewpoints. As a result, millions of students have been given limited perspective concerning the contributions, struggles, and participation of women and minorities in our society.[16] (Sadker & Sadker, 1982, p. 73)

Our students spoke about how we presented conflict in terms of multiple perspectives. Sarah speaks about perspectives being necessary when dealing with women and people of color in textbook materials. She has seemingly been able to take a holistic view of social studies content.

I: The next question I have for you is, you do use a social studies textbook?

S: Yeah, but, not as much as we use different perspectives.

I: Okay, now, um, the authors are thinking about writing a new one and they want your advice on how ... ya know, they want students' advice on what they could do with the new textbook?

---

[16]When we think of a global community the term "minority" seems ludicrous and ethonocentric, and can be viewed as offensive. As Nieto (1992) states:

> Minority is a misnomer. It is never used to describe, for example, Swedish Americans, Albanian Americans, or Dutch Americans. Yet strictly speaking, these groups, being a numerical minority in our society, should also be referred to as such. The term has historically been used only to refer to racial minorities, thus implying a status less than that accorded to other groups. In fact, even when such groups are no longer a "minority," the language by which we describe them becomes convoluted and almost comical in its effort to retain this pejorative classification. Thus, schools in which African-American students become the majority are called "majority minority" schools rather than "primarily Black" schools. There seems to be a tenacious insistence on maintaining the "minority" status of some groups even when they are no longer "minority" in fact. The connection between the low status in the use of this term is quite clear. Given this connotation, the word is offensive. (p. 17)

S: Well, I'd say that if they worried about Black Americans, they should get a Black American that knew a slave to write a certain chapter about the Black Americans and if they were going to write a little bit about Indians, to get an Indian's perspective. And if they were going to write something about women to get a woman's perspective. I'd say, instead of us collecting all these different books, just have it all in one book and have a whole bunch of different perspectives in the same book.

I: Okay.

S: Because when just the White men write it, like, White men want to make White men sound good, ya know what I mean? But, Black men really know how bad that they were a long time ago so maybe, I mean, it's nice to think that you want to sound good but, we want to know the truth, ya know, we want to know what really happened. And so I say, like, get...get somebody else to, like, put what really happened and stuff like that. And then get a White man's perspective. Like if you're talking about Black Americans, get a White man's perspective, an Indian's perspective, a woman's perspective and a Black man's perspective. And have all these different kinds of people's perspectives on the same thing.

The students connected concepts in novel ways, ways in which we had not connected them before. For example, Sarah links collaboration and perspective. She shows how discussions with peers allows her to see multiple perspectives.

I: What are some different things that you have done working in group in your class? Since I haven't been there I really am not sure.

S: Well, sometimes we work in small groups, like two and three people and sometimes we work with the whole class group. We get the whole class together and talk about a lot of different ideas.... We start out with one question and it builds up on different questions. And, like, somebody mentions another movie that they saw and then that will remind

somebody of something else. And so...we get a whole bunch of different ideas. But, if you work with partners, you have two different partners, two different perspectives. I say something, he says something. I build a little bit off his and he builds a little bit off mine. And then, like, it kind of flows but, not as well when your partner doesn't really say anything.

In the following interview segment, Alex connects perspective and collaboration, saying that textbook makers should try some more perspectives when asked how to change textbooks in the future. He also seems to have internalized the concept of collaboration in thinking about academic text. He is saying that as a reader of academic text, he needs to be able to evaluate which perspectives he deems most fitting, therefore, he needs multiple perspectives.

I: After all the units that you've been studying in social studies, what would you tell textbook makers in the future to do with colonization or any other units like the Revolutionary War?

A: Try some other perspectives. Instead of just giving them your perspective, they need more than one so they can choose which one they think is right. Instead of just having one, and saying that's the one that has to be right because that's the only one.

I: Available.

A: Yes.

I: Why is it important to have more than one perspective.

A: Because that way you can get more ideas and they you can collaborate and mix them together.

He goes on to tell what he'd do in the future if he received only the textbook's perspective.

A: [I'd] probably talk to the teacher about it.

I: Why would you do that?

A: When she'd get done reading to us out of the textbook then I'd say, "We're only getting one perspective and we need some more ideas, could you some books in or something, or could the class bring in some books they have on whatever subject we're doing so we can get some more ideas. Like, you're asking us to say something that we don't even know about but the textbook is not telling us."

Alex seems to see that he can challenge authority and offer alternatives to the teacher. He suggests that as a learning community the students can bring in books that would provide more perspectives.

We wanted to expose the harsh realities of historical events to our fifth graders. We believe, as Banks (1991-1992) does, "People of color and women are also demanding that the facts about their victimization be told, for truth's sake, but also because they need to better understand their conditions so that they and others can work to reform society" (p. 33).

We were trying to help children recognize the continuity of historical events, to help them see inequality and discrimination in the past as well as in the present. For example, we had a bulletin board on the back wall for current events which highlighted the concepts we were dealing with. We also discussed the rise of the women's movement in relation to the antislavery movement.

In his interview, Alex talks about the women's movement from the previous era:

I: Do you remember which movement was linked or connected to the movement to end slavery?

A: Like what they did?

I: No, we talked about different movements, like the movement to end slavery, and another group grew out of that one because another group realized they didn't have rights.

A: Oh, the women.

I: Can you tell me a little about that?

A: At first the men said that if women went to school that their brains would just blow up or fry because they weren't made to be what men are right now. They weren't allowed to be priests, they were only allowed to work at home. After a while they said, "Holy cow, we're being discriminated against."

I: Who said that?

A: The women. And they started getting sick of being pushed around and told what to do and not being able to speak in public and not being able to give their perspectives and not being able to have a good education. So women called the Grimke sisters began to break the laws and they would fight for their rights. Not quite fight, but they would tell the White men off and they would speak in public even when they were not allowed to and I'm sure they were arrested a couple of times.

He then goes on to connect the discrimination women felt in previous eras to current times. From hearing this in his interview we assert that he was able to transfer the concepts of discrimination, sexism, and stereotyping to a totally new context, the television show "Monsters." He has integrated across contexts. What he has learned in science and social studies he has applied outside the classroom. Alex first heard stereotype as a concept in science. In social studies we worked further with it.

I: Are there things you know now about history that you didn't at the beginning of the year?

A: I wasn't sure about slavery. I thought that it was just something where they had Black people mainly and they like pay them to do their chores and they would do what they were told. But, right now I know they weren't paid and instead of being asked they were told.

I: Why is that important to know?

A: So that it doesn't happen again. So we can try to prevent it. Because history repeats itself.

I: Tell me about that. What does that mean?

A: Like discrimination that was going on with slavery and everything, and sexist, it's still going on. Like people make fun of people who look different than we do. And Black people are made fun of and they're left out.

I: When you say left out how do you mean?

A: Like if they ask some kids if they can do what they're doing they'll say no we don't want you here because you're a girl or you're Black, or you look funny, your hair is not done nicely and look at your clothes.

I: What would you call that?

A: The one like saying that they can't play because they're a girl, that's sexist. And like saying it's because they're Black, that discrimination and racist exploitation.

I: What does sexism mean?

A: Making fun of somebody because they're from a different sex. Like boys and girls, they're both from different sexes.

I: Are there any ways that women are discriminated against so there's sexism still going on?

A: Like there's stereotyping. Like a lot of, I was watching this show on 1:00 on Sunday and it's called "Monsters." Well, there's this lady who just had a baby and she doesn't have time with it because she has to work and stuff. There's this little monster about this tall with this long beard that drags all over the place, and he'll like rip her toilet out and he'll put all these things on it for like a religious sign and then she'll come home and she'll clean it up. And like at night it keeps on messing up her house. Well one day she sees him and she says why are you doing this and he says because you're not spending any time at home.

you're spending all your time at work. It's like he wanted her to be a housewife and that's kind of sexist and stereotyping. At the end she says she's working at home, she quit her job and this monster appears on the sink and he goes like this [nodding his head to show what the monster is doing] and she smiles at him and he disappeared.

I: So you think that was an example of sexism?

A: Yes, like being a housekeeper and having to stay at home to work.

Fragmentation/Isolation: By separating issues related to minorities and women from the main body of the text, instructional materials imply that these issues are less important and not a part of the cultural mainstream. (Sadker & Sadker, 1982, p. 73)

Brenda identifies fragmentation and isolation in our textbook as "the grey pages." For example, in our textbook the chapter entitled "Nationalism," there is a discussion of the Trail of Tears on the left page. The right grey-shaded page discusses Elizabeth Blackwell, the first woman to graduate from medical school. Many might argue that she is placed there to be highlighted, versus ignored. However, if you want to continue to read about the Trail of Tears, you must turn past the Blackwell page because the sentence does not end on the left-hand side. "Over 4,000 Cherokee were buried along the **Trail of Tears**, which was the route of the journey the Cherokee took ..." The reader then needs to flip the page to continue reading, " from Georgia to Oklahoma" (Helmus et al., 1990, pp. 197-198). Many people would claim this is not intentional. We would reply, as Frye does to these reactions, "It's not intentional but it's not by accident."[17] Since the people who write textbooks have been educated in a Phase 1 or Phase 2 curricula, they then perpetuate the same Phase 1 or

[17]Private communication.

Phase 2 knowledge in the textbooks they create. Some of our students became quite articulate about the concept of fragmentation and isolation.

Brenda talks at length about her recognition of the grey pages as an example of fragmentation and isolation occurring with women and/or people of color.

I: OK. Um anything else, anything you'd have them [textbook makers] take away from it or add anything specifically, any groups of people that they should include or not include?

B: Yea, include like um, when they talk about people like Phyllis Wheatly or Harriet Tubman, don't put them on a whole separate page, you know like all the other pages are white, when you turn the page it will be a grey page and you're like oh, this must be about a woman, you know and that's what it's like, I mean all the grey pages are usually about women or something that happened to a woman or about a woman you know. I mean I don't think that I've ever had one that was about a man and you know, I wish they would just include the women when they say the men like they had the daughters of liberty and I thought that was neat because they have a big old page on it, you know they just included it with the rest of it and they put the daughters of liberty like it was nothing, I mean not too special but not too wrong about them you know. Like the um, like the sons of liberty, if they had sons of liberty they would probably, you know they would put that, they'd put that in there with the rest of it and I like that because I'm really sick of turning the page and having a big, grey page and you go oh, here's another one about a woman.

Sarah also talks about isolation and fragmentation when asked about how she would advise textbook makers in the future.

I: Is there anything else? Is there anything you want to take out or that you want to add?

S: Um, sometimes they have a page and then they don't finish the same page and then the page about a certain woman and then they finish what they were writing on the page before and the page after it. I say, finish the thing...

I: Okay.

S: Do it in order and they you don't, like, write and then, like, in the middle of a sentence stop and put a page about a woman and then finish the sentence on the next page.

I: It's confusing to you?

S: Yeah, it's confusing because, like, to read that and then you read about this woman and then you forget where you were on the other thing.

What Sarah brings up about being confused is shown in the pages on Elizabeth Blackwell and the Trail of Tears. If you decide that you want to read about Elizabeth Blackwell, the Trail of Tears is interrupted, which is confusing. We assert that the Trail of Tears' and Elizabeth Blackwell's ificance are both reduced by the way in which they are laid out in the ok.

> Invisibility: Certain groups are underrepresented in curricular materials. The significant omission of women and minority groups has become so great as to imply that these groups are of less value, importance and significance in our society. (Sadker & Sadker, 1982, p. 72)

5. Classroom Clip: "When Are We Doing Men?" "Indians Are Boring." "They'll Make It Look Like a Vocabulary Word."

The complexities which arise from one classroom interaction are numerous and often unexamined. We attempted to be alert to the intricacies of teaching and learning that seemingly "simple" interactions uncovered. There were many classroom interactions which we analyzed, the following is important in terms of the analytical tools we were using to revision the curriculum, teaching and learning.

One way in which we were trying to include women was to read biographies of women who had lived during Colonial times. The day after we read about Anne Hutchinson, we were going to read about Anne Bradstreet. Hasbach put Anne Bradstreet's name on the board. She heard Billy say, "Why are we doing all these women--when are we doing men?" He said it loud enough for her to hear, but not loud enough for other students to hear over the classroom noise. Hasbach replied that, "The text deals with a lot of men, we are trying to get a balanced perspective. She said it to him rather than to the whole class--it was almost as if this "private" conversation was just in passing. As the children were writing down Anne's name, another boy said, "Why are these all girls?" At that point, she consciously paid attention to what was occurring. She almost dismissed Billy's comment as a singular perception of the "overabundance" of women, but when this second comment surfaced she thought, "This needs to be dealt with."

She waited until after reading the Anne Bradstreet biography to address the issue.

Hasbach: I just want to address something that Billy said, "Why are we doing all these women--when are we doing men?" Actually, history texts deal a lot with men. You know, what I think is funny--we've dealt with only two women so far and it seems like a lot. And what I think is interesting, we've only talked about two women in depth--for people, for many of us that may seem like an awful lot--that's because we're not used to hearing the stories of women and we're not used to hearing the stories of Native Americans--not used to hearing the stories of Black Americans and of Hispanics. And so what's interesting is that when we do pay attention to these people in history-we--people start saying, "Wait a minute, all we're doing is focusing on Blacks, and women, and Native Americans, and Hispanics. What's interesting is that your text deals mostly with what men did during Colonial times--White men. So we want to give

a balanced perspective because all these people were alive during that time--doing many things--that oftentimes doesn't get addressed.

Cevin: [child with Native-American heritage] I think it's boring to talk about Indians.

Hasbach: [somewhat taken aback--while recognizing that it is not uncommon for groups who have been oppressed by others to discount their own history] You may--maybe a lot of people don't feel that way. Can you tell me why you feel that way?

Cevin: [Mumbles] ... I just don't like ... [inaudible]

Hasbach: You don't think that what they did during Colonial America is interesting? What I guess I find interesting about what you say is when groups are left out of historical enquiry and when we don't know much about them from a historical perspective--we think they're not interesting. Because what we focus on are the things that have been talked a lot about over time.

A discussion ensued with Hoekwater talking about the need for subject matter knowledge. Hasbach drew attention to the quotes on the wall which Hoekwater had put up. "The history of the world is the history of a privileged few."

Hasbach: This is one of the interesting things--often we don't get the story of Native Americans, or women, or Hispanics, or Blacks because they didn't have privilege--they didn't have many rights--if any. They weren't written about very much. That's one of the reasons that we're talking about these different groups.

Cevin: I don't like the way they say something like <u>Native Americans</u>, it sticks out.

Hasbach: It's almost like there's extra emphasis put on it. One of the things Mrs. Hoekwater and I are trying to give is a balanced perspective and so we keep mentioning these groups. It must feel like it sticks out. You keep hearing these groups. But one of the reasons we keep emphasizing it so much--we feel a lot

of the stuff you've learned in the past-and in your text--history text--doesn't do it justice--doesn't do every group which existed during that time--we want to do it justice in a way which it should be. It must feel like it's sticking out--keep talking about them. You know, what Mrs. Hoekwater and I would like is if all textbooks really integrated this stuff and no one stuck out in history.

Hoekwater: In your history textbook, if they mention a woman doing something at that time--they have all those pages about what's going on and then two or three sentences mentioning a woman. If they mention it at all. That's where it's not balanced because women, Native Americans, Blacks--all these groups were an integral part of our history--We're teaching history, not just teaching about the important things that men have done at that time.

Hoekwater mentioned the Colonial timeline on the back wall. "All men." A discussion followed regarding the timeline pictures. She emphasized "No women, no Native Americans, no Blacks."

Hoekwater: It's almost as if they didn't exist during that time period and that's what we're really trying to do.

Hasbach: And that's what many groups feel when we talk about history. They are invisible--that they didn't exist. I guess that's why it must feel like we're emphasizing it all the time because these groups weren't invisible. They did lots of wonderful things and that we need to remember.

A discussion followed regarding why history is important. Near the end of class, before Hoekwater had to put children in height order for music, Brenda calls Hasbach over and explains her theory on why these groups are emphasized in the textbook. Hasbach was amazed at her ability to articulate this emphasis in a very sophisticated manner (in children's words). She calls the attention of the class.

Hasbach: I have to interrupt (Hoekwater was trying to arrange them) because Brenda said something to me that I think--Cevin

explains to you what it is that you think about emphasis--the emphasis--Brenda just said something to me--sort of a rationale why--why it feels like such an emphasis.

Brenda: They'll put in Native Americans or women in the book and they will underline them or put them in darker black and they'll make it look like a vocabulary word or something. And if they wrote it more in the book, they wouldn't have to make it stick out as much.

Hoekwater: That's right.

Hasbach: [to Brenda] You explained it in a way I couldn't. That's great!

Brenda analyzed what textbook makers were doing in trying to compensate for invisible groups in history. She connects the fragmentation and isolation constructs and links them to the issue of invisibility. In her own fifth-grade language she articulated difficult concepts, in essence, deconstructed text.

To try and understand why Cevin felt that Indians were boring, we turn to the body of theoretical work which states that groups which have been oppressed, internalize their oppressors (see Freire, 1970; Miller, 1986). They come to identify with their oppressors, versus with their own group which has been subjugated and oppressed. As Miller (1986) states,

> Subordinates, then, know much more about the dominants than vice versa. They have to. They become highly attuned to the dominants, able to predict their reactions of pleasure and displeasure...Another important result is that subordinates often know more about the dominants than they know about themselves. If a large part of your fate depends on accommodating and to and pleasing the dominants, you concentrate on them. Indeed there is little purpose in knowing yourself. Why should you when your knowledge of the dominants determines your life? ...
>
> Tragic confusion arises because subordinates absorb a large part of the untruths created by the dominants; there are a great many blacks who feel inferior to whites, and women

> who still believe they are less important than men. This internalization of dominant beliefs is more likely to occur if there are few alternative concepts at hand. (pp. 10-11)

We asked ourselves if Miller's analysis explains Cevin's comment that Indians are boring, in essence, saying his own heritage is boring? We further asked if textbooks unintentionally ensure that certain groups will not know their own history?

6. Students Connecting Invisibility and Visibility to Their Social Text

Both Cevin's and Brenda's comments uncover issues of invisibility and visibility. We stressed the concept of visibility and invisibility with our students. The students seemed to use the concepts fluently in regard to content and community. Alex talks about invisible and visible groups in history.

I: What groups have sometimes been invisible in history?

A: Women, colored people, definitely not men, men have been very visible, and like people from different countries, when they're kidnapped and taken over here. They don't they're left out and they're used for improper reasons.

I: When you say used for improper reasons, is there a word we've used that would explain that idea?

A: Exploitation.

I: Right. Are there ways to change invisibility? Are there things we can do to make groups visible?

A: Yes, we can get more perspectives on them instead of the man's perspective. We can get some colored people and some women's perspectives and asked them what they think happened.

Maria-Yolanda connects discrimination to invisibility, saying that race has a lot to do with why certain groups are invisible in history. She

raises the issue of respect for others as a way to change invisibility in history.

I: Some groups have been invisible in history. First, let's think about the word invisible. What does that mean?

M: They weren't like nobody really paid attention to them. They discriminated against them and I know the groups. The colored, the Hispanics, and the Mexican Americans. Those people were very invisible because they didn't have their rights and they were discriminated against.

I: And why do you think they were made invisible?

M: Because of their color, because of their pigment.

I: Can that be changed?

M: Yes, it could. If it was my way I would make it as in people respect each others feelings. Everybody should respect each others feelings and it doesn't matter they are they are the same. They have the same feelings, they don't like to be hurt.

In her interview, Sarah talks about invisibility and visibility. For Sarah, Maria-Yolanda is a real-life example of being "not visible." She distinguishes between "not visible" and "invisible." Sarah talks about Maria-Yolanda's silence in class accounting for her not being visible.

I: Okay. Next thing is, what do you think being invisible means in social studies?

S: Well, that people don't think about you and that you're an invisible problem or, like, women's thoughts were just invisible back then because, like, it didn't matter what ... who they thought should be president because they couldn't vote, they were just invisible. And it didn't matter what Black Americans thought about slavery because ... they were invisible. It didn't really matter.

I: So they were, it's kind of their thoughts are ...

S: They don't matter.

I: They just don't even matter. Okay, on the opposite side, what do you think being visible means?

S: Visible? Like White Americans are visible because they have all the power and that you could see them [inaudible] and their ideas counted and that whatever they had to say, it was usually important because they have power and they weren't invisible.

I: Okay. Now, um, in your social studies class, do you think that there's anybody in there that you would consider invisible?

S: No, because everybody should be treated equally. Some people don't, like, they just sit there really quiet, like my friend, Maria-Yolanda. I really like her a whole lot but, she doesn't ... she just sits there quiet, she's not visible for her ideas to count, but she doesn't really say a whole lot.

I: Okay.

S: She just kind of sits there and ... I think some people have good ideas and that they should try sharing them sometimes, but nobody is invisible.

Since Maria-Yolanda is Sarah's friend, this may affect her wanting to distinguish between Maria-Yolanda being "not visible" versus invisible. The question that is raised for us is, what about all the students in classes who have few peers they can call friends? Are they "invisible": are they ciphers when they are silent in the social text of the classroom?

What is critical to note about Maria-Yolanda, is that she spoke so rarely in social studies that we assumed she was totally disengaged. All her "nonverbal indicators of [dis]engagement" (Brown, 1991) made the "silent" statement that she was not with us. The only way in which we discovered how wrong we were was by interviewing her. This has

implications for the way in which we assess children on the basis of in-class behaviors. It also has implications for paying attention to all three of the classroom texts.

Adrienne Rich speaks poignantly of the effect that invisibility has on people. She alerts us to the students we have in class who may be invisible, the ciphers who have slipped through the cracks.

> Invisibility is a dangerous and painful condition, and lesbians are not the only people to know it. When those who have power to name and socially construct reality and choose not to see you or hear you, whether you are dark-skinned, old, disabled, female, or speak with a different accent or dialect than theirs, when someone with the authority of a teacher, say, describe the world and you are not in it, there is a moment of psychic disequilibrium, as if you looked in a mirror and saw nothing. Yet you know you exist and others like you, that this is a game with mirrors. It takes some strength of soul--and not just individual strength, but collective understanding--to resist this void, this nonbeing, into which you are thrust, and to stand up, demanding to be seen and heard, and to make yourself visible, to claim that your experience is just as real and normative as any other. (Rich, 1984, p. 199)

In her interview, Brenda links the concept of visibility and invisibility to the larger societal community and her own learning community. Brenda speaks to the issue of invisibility in regard to Roxanne, a child who was "larger" than her peers. She was described by them as "ugly" and was generally treated as an outcast. As one child wrote, "I discrimanated Roxamne by calling her fat and ugly and a zit face." (Journal entry, 1/8/91) Brenda's depiction of Roxanne's "visibility" and "invisibility" is a poignant echo to Rich's "dangerous and painful condition." Brenda alerts us to the living and social text of the classroom as does Rich.

I: Is it just in books that someone is visible or invisible?

B: No, it's someone can be visible or invisible right now I mean you might see people in a crowd you know and the person, people that would be invisible might not be the real pretty or the real handsome ones and the people that were, were visible were the people that were real pretty or handsome or something.

I: Is there anyone in your social studies class who is especially visible?

B: [pause] Well...

I: These won't go, I won't show these to anyone in your class.

B: Well, to some people like Roxanne, she's visible but invisible. People make fun of her, which means that they see her and they notice her but they don't notice her as being good, just because she's overweight or something they make fun of her. But I think that she can be really nice if you give her a chance. But sometimes um, like they'll be making fun of her or something and I don't think that's right you know because we'll go, "Get out of here Roxanne, you're too fat for us or you're not nice enough to be with us," and really it hurts me just as bad as it, I mean not as bad but it would probably be very, I mean it would hurt and with, I mean visible because everyone sees her as someone fat and ugly or something you know and I notice her as a nice person... she's overweight and I don't think that's something to make fun of anybody about. I can't imagine, I can't imagine being her ...

Brenda's discussion of Roxanne points to a powerful example of the living text and the social text. Brenda reveals her ability to empathize with Roxanne's circumstance and just as importantly, Brenda's rendition of Roxanne's experiences uncovers the necessity of teachers to become aware of the themes in children's lives. Their lives are made unbearable in many circumstances and teachers are not even aware of it. Roxanne's historicity impacts the way in which the other children interact with her. The cultural messages the other children have gotten about attractiveness

affect the ways in which they treat her. These all intersect to impact her experiences in the class.

Lansberg (1983) addresses the issue of what Roxanne and others have had to endure in terms of being larger than is deemed socially acceptable. People who do not meet the "standards" set up by the culture are outcasts and are seen as "the guilty authors of their own misery," the guilty authors of their own living text:

> Jiggle. Flab, waddle, chubby, bulge. Blubber.
> All our words about fatness are comic-repulsive; naturally, since fat people are society's last legitimate scapegoat. You can no longer openly despise people of different color, people who lisp or limp or talk with an accent. But fat people are considered the guilty authors of their own misery [emphasis added]. In a world spilling over with abundance, where gourmet cooking and fine dining are badges of chic affluence, to be overweight is, paradoxically, to look poor and be loathsome. (p. 160)

Brenda has disclosed a theme in Roxanne's life. Roxanne is like many other children in our classes, children who are outcasts because they are "different." These perceived differences are socially constructed and are expressed within the community of the classroom. As teachers we need to start listening to what children are experiencing, by their own definitions, not merely adult-imposed definitions. This we can do by listening to them, not just by talking at them. After hearing about Roxanne's daily torment by other children, we feel that we must let children expose the realities in their own lives, rather than just the ones we project on to them. Often adults will dismiss a child's suffering because it isn't about an "important" issue, but as Steinem (1992) says, "[no on should] have to win a competition of suffering in order to take ... damage seriously. There can

be no 'competition of tears,'...Tears are tears, suffering is suffering" (pp. 71-72).

7. Classroom Clip: Maria-Yolanda Connecting Racism and Discrimination to Her Social Text

> She could see the boy staring at her, examining each feature of her face and figure. She knew what he was thinking: that the skin was rather light brown and the hair, while curly, was almost, well, white in construction. The mouth and nose were so beautiful; they belonged to the skin.
>
> "Your father?" he said.
>
> "Color seems to be problem for some people."
>
> "Yes," said the boy.
>
> "Every day," she said, "I am aware of my color--made aware of my color or that I have a color or that I belong to a color. I am always my color first and Anna second. As if people can be divided, carved up that way." (Otto, 1991, p. 141)

On December 4, 1990 we were co-teaching one of the introductory lessons on the unit of Colonization. The students were working in their groups discussing the concepts we chose to weave throughout the unit and year. This classroom clip provides an example of one of many occasions when the students, in this case Maria-Yolanda, integrated the social studies concepts into their daily life experiences.

As we were walking around the classroom, Maria-Yolanda called Hasbach over to where her group was working on the concept of racism. She asked Hasbach if racism was "like against me because of my color?" Hasbach recalls that her response was, "Yes, people of color experience racism." Natalie (White) seemed to "correct" Maria-Yolanda. Natalie explained, "It's like teasing Beth [African American] because of her color. No ... not you. You are the same as us. You just look like you have a tan--a tan that doesn't go away." At that point Natalie giggled nervously. Maria-Yolanda turned away from Natalie, said nothing, and had a look on

her face which Hasbach was unable to read. The closest she can come to explaining Maria-Yolanda's reactions was that it seemed like a mixture of resignation and disdain.

> What do I do now? I did not know how to respond, but I am acutely aware that this was an extremely important interaction which had many ramifications. I said to myself, I can deal with this when we come together as a large group. I need to talk to the others about this. As I sat in Kathy Roth's classroom, I started to berate myself, believing that I had missed a "teachable moment." What could I have done? Maybe I could have asked Maria-Yolanda how she felt about what Natalie had said, but I stopped myself and thought that would be putting both children on the spot. I felt perturbed and confused, needing to get direction from others about what to do. I was struck by the fact that I was out of my depth in relation to fifth-graders. I would have at least had a framework out of which to work had they been pre-service teachers. Where do I begin talking about these deep theoretical and conceptual issues which Natalie in her innocent remark honed in on? How do I make this a meaningful learning experience for everyone involved? Natalie had articulated a pervasive, tacit societal agreement, that White is the standard or norm by which all else is measured. The closer one is to White the better. The further away one is to White the worse, the more "deviant." (Hasbach, Journal entry, 1990)

After analyzing this interaction we felt that on some level Natalie was aware of the stratification of privilege and oppression. In her innocent statement unwittingly lies one of the fundamental rules of privilege and oppression. Those who do not fit the "standard" are victims of oppression, but the closer one is to the "standard," the more privilege one may receive. Natalie's statement seemed to uncover the issue of "passing" which people of color talk about. There is privilege and acceptance associated with "passing as White," therefore, an internalization of the insidious "White is right" can occur. Listening to adult victims'

voices of this internalization is another way to hear what Natalie was uncovering in her fifth-grade language.

> What we learned about survival-trying to-pass-for-white, easy-to-pass-for-white, "she couldn't pass in a million years." Here we introduce you to the "color problem" as it was first introduced to us: "not white enuf, not dark enuf," always up against a color chart that first got erected far outside our families and our neighborhoods, but which invaded them both with systematic determination. In speaking of color and class, Tillie Olsen once said, "There's no such thing as passing"...all of us have been victims of the invisible violation which happens indoors and inside ourselves: the self-abnegation, the silence, the constant threat of cultural obliteration.... It doesn't take many years to realize the privileges, or lack thereof, attached to a particular shade of skin or texture of hair. (Moraga & Anzaldua, 1983, p. 6)

Through discussing these concepts, the children uncovered submerged racism. This uncovering was an essential first step to grapple with issues of discrimination and racism. Yet, we suspect that many educators feel the way that Hasbach felt at the time.

> This uncovering of what I would call unconscious oppression was crucial, yet there was another part of me that felt a yearning to just ignore it, to just deal with "easier" issues in the classroom. Within this yearning lies a dangerous tendency, that of ignoring those complex issues which surround race, class, gender, and culture. It frightens me to know that I have worked in the area of equity and diversity, yet, I am unable to act in the "heat of the moment." Instead, I feel out of my element. I wonder what it must be like for teachers who have even less preparation in thinking about these issues? Does this imply a significant piece missing from teacher preparation? Do we deal with this lack of preparation by avoiding topics which could unleash these issues? (Hasbach, Journal entry, 1990)

We believe that many teachers are unprepared to deal with many of the issues surrounding the living text in the classroom. This classroom clip

reveals two important implications which need to be explored: the ways in which these children have already been versed in racism and how they themselves are victims of racism. The macrospective significance which this microspective incident signifies, that a fifth-grade child is already able to articulate the lessons of racism in this society, needs to be explored. As educators we need to know how to deal with these complex and potentially explosive issues. We need to start talking about the pervasive fear that many educators have in relation to "hot" issues of race, class, gender, and culture.

The incident also has implications for teaching teachers. When teacher-educators work with preservice and inservice teachers, those teachers in turn work with children. This means that educators at all levels need to think about ways of dealing with these issues.

The implications this classroom clip has in relation to Maria-Yolanda is also significant. She began the year by asking about racism, "Is it like against me because of my color?" By the end of the year she was speaking about the value of knowing a set of concepts that described her and her friends' realities. She became fluent in the concepts that we were studying. She was able to name her experience in terms that were "grown-up."

She has also come to understand the need for developing a common language. Apparently, Maria-Yolanda is aware of the need to relate her experiences in terms that both she and her teachers can understand. She expresses that she originally called people "rude," but now she uses a different terminology to describe her experiences.

M: [Social studies] helped me because I always thought that, not to be rude or anything, but that White people always

discriminated against my colored friends and that's what we talked about. Other colors discriminating against other races, and it was like oh I know that.

I: So you knew all that before?

M: Yes, well not the words, but I just knew that people were rude because they would say, "Hey, you N [reference is to "nigger"] word."

I: Now you said "I didn't know the words," what words?

M: Well like "discriminated." I didn't know those words. I just thought people were rude so I used to use that term rude.

I: And why is it important to learn these terms?

M: I don't know, I think they are more grown-up words. Like you know, those older people use those terms, discriminated.

I: Is that why it is important or do you think maybe it might help you better to describe ...?

M: It would help me better, because if a teacher was talking to me and said Maria-Yolanda do you know what discriminated means, it's like no I don't know that term, and then I would be like, oh I know that but I don't know the term.

For Maria-Yolanda the different classroom texts, living, academic, and social, integrated to provide a relevant and meaningful learning experience. She has experienced painful encounters with peers (e.g., being called "Mexican-burrito"). For her, as for others (such as Roxanne), to ignore the different classroom texts is doing students an injustice. On an intuitive level we knew that the issues of race, class, gender, and culture were crucial for teachers to think about. Maria-Yolanda's voice made it poignantly clear how all the pieces of education need to be thought about holistically. All the classroom texts, the living text, the academic text, and

the social text, interact and affect one another. All the classroom texts are part of an integrative whole that affects the teaching and learning process.

8. Implications: Defective Education for Teachers and for Students

As teachers we are products and agents of hegemony. In other words, we are products and agents of a culture in which an ideological system of interlocking privileges and oppressions insures that certain groups dominate others. Consequently, certain groups will be represented in curriculum, and certain other groups will be underrepresented, or not represented at all. As teachers we have often been trained in what McIntosh (1983, 1990) calls a Phase 1, or Phase 2 curriculum. Therefore, that is usually the only content we are able to share with our students, especially if we rely heavily on the textbook. But even if we do not rely solely on the textbook, most of us have not had the kind of education ourselves which would allow us to create an inclusive curriculum. We do not have a paradigm, a set of organizing principles that undergird the way we see ourselves and the world, that allows for inclusive conceptual knowledge. Therefore, we often cannot present inclusiveness to our students. We often do not ourselves have the conceptual tools to help students become critical readers of the academic, living, and social text of the classroom. We are for students in many ways the "pawnbrokers of reality" (Ford, 1975, p. 11) and the reality which we present to them is often a Phase 1 or Phase 2 reality of the world. "Teachers at all levels of schooling are part of an ideological region that has enormous importance in legitimizing the categories and social practices of the dominant society" (Giroux, 1980, p. 410). The knowledge sources we use are often those which have been validated and legitimated by Western culture and by the

"scientific paradigm." There are resounding silences in regard to multiple voices, multiple perspectives, and competing world views. We do not often reveal "the politics of print" (Bigelow, 1989, p. 639) to our students for we ourselves are not aware of them. When "literacy" and subject matter knowledge are addressed they are often still determined by hegemonic world perspectives and students receive a very narrow conception of subject matter.

When teachers are discussing content we often do not address invisible groups, those who have been and are still being silenced. As teachers we also do not often explicitly take account of our own race, class, gender and historicity, or those of our students. By believing that equality means treating everyone the same, we often are unfair to many of our students in the classroom, not seeing commonality as coexisting with difference, levelling students to a homogenous "equality" (see This Bridge Called My Back, Moraga & Anzaldua, 1983).

However, there are many ways teachers and students can resist, contest, and oppose hegemony in its various forms and manifestations. Teachers and students at every level, have the potential to reconstruct reality and for that short space of time within the classroom, they have the power to be counterhegemonic. Teachers have a considerable amount of autonomy, even though schooling and a teacher's classroom are inextricably linked to the context in which they function, that is, the dominating norms of the era and culture. Once the classroom door is closed there is a great deal of pedagogical latitude, and political space can be created to create multiple realities. Even young students have the capacity to take a critical stance and posture towards all the sources they encounter, given the opportunity. "A truly liberal education is one that

liberates us from the oppression of unexamined opinion and feeling" (Wiggins, 1989, p. 57) within the living, social, and academic texts of the classroom.

This teacher tells us we must ride the unknown ...
She says we cannot rely on a formula ...
She says we must learn from each act,
and no act is ever the same ...
... recipes are useless.

These will achieve only the conventional, she says.
But beauty demands a more arduous process.
... Suddenly, we find we have a new language ...
The possibilities, she told us are endless ...
The possibilities, we see, never end ...
(Griffin, 1978, pp. 191-192)

References

Banks, J. (1991-92). Multicultural education: For freedom's sake. Educational Leadership, 49(4), 32-36.

Belenky, M.F., Clinchy, B.M., Goldberger, N.R., & Tarule, J.M. (1986). Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind. New York: Basic Books.

Bigelow, W. (1989). Discovering Columbus: Rereading the past. Language Arts, 66, 635-643.

Brown, R. (1991). Schools of thought: How the politics of literacy shape thinking in the classroom. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, D.K. (1988). Teaching practice: Plus ca change.... (Issue Paper 88-3). East Lansing: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teaching Education.

Dewey, J. (1963). Experience and education. New York: Macmillan.

Erickson, F. (1982). Taught cognitive learning in its immediate environments: A neglected topic in anthropology of education. Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 13(2),149-179.

Evans, R.W. (1990). Teacher conceptions of history revisited: Ideology, curriculum, & student belief. Theory and Research in Social Education, 18, 101-138.

Ford, J. (1975). Paradigms: & fairy tales: Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Continuum.

Gannett, C. (1992). Gender and the journal: Diaries and academic discourse. New York: State University of New York Press.

Gilligan, C. (1990, April). Keynote speech given at conference on "Re-visioning Knowledge and the Curriculum: Feminist Perspective." Michigan State University, East Lansing.

Giroux, H. (1980). Teacher education and the ideology of social control. In H. Giroux & D. Purpel (Eds.), The hidden curriculum and moral education (pp. 403-425). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Griffin, S. (1978). Woman and nature: The roaring inside her. New York: Harper & Row.

Grumet, M. (1978-79). Autobiography and reconceptualization. In H. Giroux, A. Penna & W. Pinar (Eds.), Curriculum and instruction (pp.139-144). New York: McCutchan.

Helmus, T.M., Toppin, E. A., Pounds, N. J., & Arnsdorf, V. E. (1990). The United States yesterday and today. Morristown, NJ: Silver Burdett & Ginn.

Johnston, J. (1973). They led the way. New York: Scholastic.

King, A., & Brownell, J. (1966). The curriculum and the disciplines of knowledge. New York: Wiley

Lansberg, M. (1983). Women and children first. New York: Penguin.

Lester, J. (1968). To be a slave. New York: Scholastic.

Lortie, D.C. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Marshall, H. (1990). Beyond the workplace metaphor: The classroom as a learning setting. Theory Into Practice, 29(2), 94-101.

Maybe the white men made it up. (1992, Winter/Spring). Changing Minds, pp. 4-8.

Making sense and making citizens: Revising social studies (1992, Winter/Spring). Changing Minds, pp. 1-3.

McIntosh, P. (1983). Interactive phases of curricular re-vision: A feminist perspective (Working Paper No. 124). Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College, Center for Research on Women.

McIntosh, P. (1988). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies (Working Paper No. 189). Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College, Center for Research on Women.

McIntosh, P. (1990). Interactive phases of curricular and personal re-vision with regard to race (Working Paper No. 219). Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College, Center for Research on Women.

McIntosh, P. (1991, July) Presentation at SEED [Seeking Educational Equity and Diversity] Workshop, Palo Alto, California.

Miller, J.B. (1986). Toward a new psychology of women. Boston: Beacon.

Moraga, C., & Anzaldua, G. (Eds.). (1983). This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color. New York: Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press.

Nieto, S. (1992). Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education. New York: Longman.

Otto, W. (1991). How to make an American quilt: A novel. New York: Villard Books.

Parker, W. (1989). How to help students learn history and geography. Educational Leadership, 47(3), 39-43.

Pfordresher, J. (1991). How will cultural diversity affect teaching? The Education Digest, (pp. 49-51). Condensed from Basic Education (November, 1990) 35, pp. 7-11.

Putnam, J., & Burke, J.B. (1992). Organizing and managing classroom learning communities. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Rich, A. (1984). Blood, bread, and poetry: Selected prose 1979-1985. New York: Norton.

Roth, K., Ligett, C., Derksen, J., Hasbach, C., Hoekwater, E., & Woodhams, P. (1991). Many voices: Learning to teach social studies. Unpublished manuscript, Michigan State University.

Sadker, M.P., Sadker, D.M. (1982). Sex equity handbook for schools. New York: Longman.

Stein, R.C. (1985). The story of the Trail of Tears. Chicago: Regensteiner.

Steinem, G. (1992). Revolution from within: A book of self-esteem. Boston: Little, Brown.

Wheelock, M., & Weaver, K. (1985). One fine day [Video]. Hollywood, CA: Circe Records & Ishtar Films.

van Manen, M. (1982). Phenomenological pedagogy. Curriculum Inquiry, 12, 283-299.

Wiggins, G. (1989, November). The futility of trying to teach everything of importance. Educational Leadership, 47(3), 48, 57-59.